

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD  
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

364 Knollcrest Drive, Suite 205, Redding, California 96002  
Phone (530) 224-4845 • Fax (530) 224-4857  
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>

**ORDER R5-2016-XXXX  
NPDES NO. CA0079081**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE CITY OF CHICO,  
CHICO WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PLANT, BUTTE COUNTY**

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements (WDR's) set forth in this Order:

**Table 1. Discharger Information**

<b>Discharger</b>	<b>City of Chico</b>
<b>Name of Facility</b>	<b>Chico Water Pollution Control Plant</b>
<b>Facility Address</b>	<b>4827 Chico River Road</b>
	<b>Chico, CA 95927</b>
	<b>Butte County</b>

**Table 2. Discharge Location**

<b>Discharge Point</b>	<b>Effluent Description</b>	<b>Discharge Point Latitude (North)</b>	<b>Discharge Point Longitude (West)</b>	<b>Receiving Water</b>
D-001	<b>Secondary treated wastewater</b>	<b>39° 41' 28.55"N</b>	<b>121° 56' 26.76"W</b>	<b>Sacramento River</b>
D-002	<b>Secondary treated wastewater</b>	<b>39° 41' 42.85"N</b>	<b>121° 54' 43.12"W</b>	<b>Underlying Groundwater</b>

**Table 3. Administrative Information**

This Order was adopted on:	<b>2X April 2016</b>
This Order shall become effective on:	<b>1 June 2016</b>
This Order shall expire on:	<b>31 May 2021</b>
The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge as an application for reissuance of WDR's in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, and an application for reissuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit no later than:	<b>2 December 2020</b>
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region have classified this discharge as follows:	<b>Major</b>

I, PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of the Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on **2X April 2016**.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**PAMELA C. CREEDON**, Executive Officer

**CONTENTS**

I. Facility Information ..... 3

II. Findings ..... 3

III. Discharge Prohibitions ..... 4

IV. Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications ..... 4

    A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-001 (Discharges to the Sacramento River) ..... 4

        1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-001 ..... 4

    B. Land Discharge Specifications – Discharge Point D-002 ..... 6

        1. Land Discharge Specifications – Discharge Point D-002 (Discharges to the M&T Pond) ... 6

    C. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable ..... 6

V. Receiving Water Limitations ..... 6

    A. Surface Water Limitations ..... 6

    B. Groundwater Limitations ..... 8

VI. Provisions ..... 9

    A. Standard Provisions ..... 9

    B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements ..... 12

    C. Special Provisions ..... 12

        1. Reopener Provisions ..... 12

        2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements ..... 14

        3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention ..... 16

        4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications ..... 17

        5. Land Application Area Requirements. Not Applicable ..... 18

        6. Water Recycling Requirements. Not Applicable ..... 18

        7. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTW's Only) ..... 18

        8. Compliance Schedules ..... 20

VII. Compliance Determination ..... 21

**TABLES**

Table 1. Discharger Information ..... 1

Table 2. Discharge Location ..... 1

Table 3. Administrative Information ..... 1

Table 4. Effluent Limitations ..... 4

Table 5. Land Discharge Specifications ..... 6

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A – Definitions ..... A-1

Attachment B – Map ..... B-1

Attachment C – Flow Schematic ..... C-1

Attachment D – Standard Provisions ..... D-1

Attachment E – Monitoring and Reporting Program ..... E-1

Attachment F – Fact Sheet ..... F-1

Attachment G – Summary Of Reasonable Potential Analysis ..... G-1

Attachment H – Calculation of WQBEL'S ..... H-1

Attachment I – Requirements for Monitoring Well Installation Work Plans and Monitoring Well Installation Reports ..... I-1

## I. FACILITY INFORMATION

Information describing the Chico Water Pollution Control Plant (Facility) is summarized in Table 1 and in sections I and II of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F). Section I of the Fact Sheet also includes information regarding the Facility's permit application.

## II. FINDINGS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (hereinafter Central Valley Water Board), finds:

- A. Legal Authorities.** This Order serves as WDR's pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. EPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as an NPDES permit for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters.
- B. Background and Rationale for Requirements. The Central Valley Water Board developed the** requirements in this Order based on information submitted as part of the application, through monitoring and reporting programs, and other available information. The Fact Sheet (Attachment F), which contains background information and rationale for the requirements in this Order, is hereby incorporated into and constitutes Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E and G and H are also incorporated into this Order.
- C. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law.** The provisions/requirements in subsections IV.B, IV.C, V.B, and VI.C are included to implement state law only. These provisions/requirements are not required or authorized under the federal CWA; consequently, violations of these provisions/requirements are not subject to the enforcement remedies that are available for NPDES violations.
- D. Monitoring and Reporting.** 40 C.F.R. section 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and State requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program is provided in Attachment E.

The technical and monitoring reports in this Order are required in accordance with Water Code section 13267, which states the following in subsection (b)(1), *"In conducting an investigation specified in subdivision (a), the regional board may require that any person who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged discharging, or who proposes to discharge waste within its region, or any citizen or domiciliary, or political agency or entity of this state who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged or discharging, or who proposes to discharge, waste outside of its region could affect the quality of waters within its region shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the regional board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports. In requiring those reports, the regional board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports."*

The Discharger owns and operates the Facility subject to this Order. The monitoring reports required by this Order are necessary to determine compliance with this Order. The need for the monitoring reports is discussed in the Fact Sheet.

- E. Notification of Interested Parties.** The Central Valley Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDR's for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of the notification are provided in the Fact Sheet.
- F. Consideration of Public Comment.** The Central Valley Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge. Details of the Public Hearing are provided in the Fact Sheet.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Order R5-2010-0019 is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order. This action in no way prevents the Central Valley Water Board from taking enforcement action for past violations of the previous Order.

**III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS**

- A.** Discharge of wastewater from the Facility, as the Facility is specifically described in the Fact Sheet in section II.B, in a manner different from that described in this Order is prohibited.
- B.** The by-pass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by Federal Standard Provisions I.G. and I.H. (Attachment D).
- C.** Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in section 13050 of the Water Code.
- D.** The Discharger shall not allow pollutant-free wastewater to be discharged into the treatment or disposal system in amounts that significantly diminish the system's capability to comply with this Order. Pollutant-free wastewater means rainfall, groundwater, cooling waters, and condensates that are essentially free of pollutants.
- E.** Discharge or application of waste classified as 'hazardous', as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 23, Section 2521(a), or 'designated', as defined in Water Code section 13173, is prohibited.

**IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS**

**A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-001 (Discharges to the Sacramento River)**

**1. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point D-001**

The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point D-001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E:

- a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the effluent limitations specified in Table 4:

**Table 4. Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	30	45	90	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	3002	4504	9007	--	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	30	45	90	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	3002	4504	9007	--	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	8.5
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	8.2	17.6	--	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	821	1761	--	--	--
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	15	--	20	--	--
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	17.2	--	34	--	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	25.2	--	43	--	--
Nitrate plus Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	60	104	--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> Based upon design dry weather flow of 12 million gallons per day (MGD).

- b. **Percent Removal:** The average monthly percent removal of 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>) and total suspended solids (TSS) shall not be less than 85 percent.
- c. **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity.** Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:
  - 70%, minimum for any one bioassay; and
  - 90%, median for any three consecutive bioassays.
- d. **Total Residual Chlorine.** Effluent total residual chlorine shall not exceed:
  - 0.011 mg/L, as a 4-day average; and
  - 0.019 mg/L, as a 1-hour average.
- e. **Total Coliform Organisms.** Effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed:
  - 23 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median; and
  - 240 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period.
- f. **Average Dry Weather Flow.** The average dry weather discharge flow shall not exceed 12 MGD.
- g. **Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon.** Effluent chlorpyrifos and diazinon concentrations shall not exceed the sum of one (1.0) as identified below:

**Average Monthly Effluent Limitation**

$$S_{AMEL} = \frac{C_{DM-AVG}}{0.079} + \frac{C_{CM-AVG}}{0.012} \leq 1.0$$

$C_{DM-AVG}$  = average monthly diazinon effluent concentration in µg/L.

$C_{CM-AVG}$  = average monthly chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in µg/L.

**Average Weekly Effluent Limitation**

$$S_{AWEL} = \frac{C_{DW-AVG}}{0.14} + \frac{C_{CW-AVG}}{0.021} \leq 1.0$$

$C_{DW-AVG}$  = weekly average diazinon effluent concentration in µg/L.

$C_{CW-AVG}$  = weekly average chlorpyrifos effluent concentration in µg/L.

**B. Land Discharge Specifications – Discharge Point D-002**

**1. Land Discharge Specifications – Discharge Point D-002 (Discharges to the M&T Pond)**

- a. Beginning **30 May 2021**, the Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following discharge specifications at Discharge Point D-002 specified in Table 5, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location LND-001 as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E.

**Table 5. Land Discharge Specifications**

Parameter	Units	Discharge Specifications		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	30	45	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	626	939	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	30	45	--
	lbs/day <sup>1</sup>	626	938	--
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	23 <sup>2</sup>	240 <sup>3</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> Based upon an average monthly flow of 2.5 million gallons per day (MGD).
- <sup>2</sup> Based upon a 7-day median concentration.
- <sup>3</sup> Shall not be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.

- b. **Percent Removal.** Beginning **30 May 2021**, the average monthly percent removal of 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>) and total suspended solids (TSS) shall not be less than 85 percent.
- c. **Flow Limitations.** Discharge flows shall not exceed the following limits:

<u>Flow Measurement</u>	<u>Flow Limit</u>
Average Monthly Flow <sup>1</sup>	2.5 MGD

<sup>1</sup> As determined by the total flow during the calendar month divided by the number of days in that month.

- d. No waste constituent shall be released, discharged, or placed where it will cause a violation of the Groundwater Limitations of this Order.
- e. The Discharger shall operate all systems and equipment to optimize the quality of the discharge.

**C. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable**

**V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS**

**A. Surface Water Limitations**

The discharge shall not cause the following in the Sacramento River:

- 1. **Bacteria.** The fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL, nor more than 10 percent of the total number of fecal coliform samples taken during any 30-day period to exceed 400 MPN/100 mL.
- 2. **Biostimulatory Substances.** Water to contain biostimulatory substances which promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

3. **Chemical Constituents.** Chemical constituents to be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
4. **Color.** Discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
5. **Dissolved Oxygen:**
  - a. The monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass;
  - b. The 95 percentile dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 75 percent of saturation; nor
  - c. The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 7.0 mg/L at any time.
6. **Floating Material.** Floating material to be present in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
7. **Oil and Grease.** Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance, result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.
8. **pH.** The pH to be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5.
9. **Pesticides:**
  - a. Pesticides to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
  - b. Pesticides to be present in bottom sediments or aquatic life in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
  - c. Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides to be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by USEPA or the Executive Officer;
  - d. Pesticide concentrations to exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies (see State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 and 40 CFR 131.12.);
  - e. Pesticide concentrations to exceed the lowest levels technically and economically achievable;
  - f. Pesticides to be present in concentration in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCL's) set forth in CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 15; nor
  - g. Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 µg/L.
10. **Radioactivity:**
  - a. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
  - b. Radionuclides to be present in excess of the MCL's specified in Table 64442 of section 64442 and Table 64443 of section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.
11. **Salinity.** Electrical conductivity (at 25 °C) shall not exceed 230 micromhos/cm (50 percentile) or 235 micromhos/cm (90 percentile) at Knights Landing above Colusa Basin Drain or 240 micromhos/cm (50 percentile) or 340 micromhos/cm (90 percentile) at I Street Bridge, based upon previous 10 years of record.

12. **Suspended Sediments.** The suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters to be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
13. **Settleable Substances.** Substances to be present in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
14. **Suspended Material.** Suspended material to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
15. **Taste and Odors.** Taste- or odor-producing substances to be present in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.
16. **Temperature.** The natural temperature to be increased by more than 5°F above natural receiving water temperature. Temperature changes due to controllable factors shall not cause the temperature to be elevated above 68°F in the reach from Hamilton City to the I Street Bridge during periods when temperature increases will be detrimental to the fishery.
17. **Toxicity.** Toxic substances to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
18. **Turbidity.**
  - a. Shall not exceed 2 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU), where natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU;
  - b. Shall not increase more than 1 NTU where natural turbidity is between 1 and 5 NTUs;
  - c. Shall not increase more than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs;
  - d. Shall not increase more than 10 NTU where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs; nor
  - e. Shall not increase more than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.

**B. Groundwater Limitations**

1. Release of waste constituents from any portion of the facility shall not cause groundwater to:
  - a. Contain constituents in concentrations that exceed either the Primary or Secondary MCLs established in the Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, or natural background water quality, whichever is greater;
  - b. Contain total coliform organisms over any 7-day period equaling or exceeding 2.2 MPN/100 mL; or
  - c. Contain taste or odor-producing constituents, toxic substances, or any other constituents in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

## VI. PROVISIONS

### A. Standard Provisions

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D.
2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions. In the event that there is any conflict, duplication, or overlap between provisions specified by this Order, the more stringent provision shall apply:
  - a. If the Discharger's wastewater treatment plant is publicly owned or subject to regulation by California Public Utilities Commission, it shall be supervised and operated by persons possessing certificates of appropriate grade according to Title 23, CCR, division 3, chapter 26.
  - b. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, this Order may be terminated or modified for cause, including, but not limited to:
    - i. violation of any term or condition contained in this Order;
    - ii. obtaining this Order by misrepresentation or by failing to disclose fully all relevant facts;
    - iii. a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge; and
    - iv. a material change in the character, location, or volume of discharge.

The causes for modification include:

- i. *New regulations.* New regulations have been promulgated under section 405(d) of the CWA, or the standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by promulgation of amended standards or regulations or by judicial decision after the permit was issued.
- ii. *Land application plans.* When required by a permit condition to incorporate a land application plan for beneficial reuse of sewage sludge, to revise an existing land application plan, or to add a land application plan.
- iii. *Change in sludge use or disposal practice.* Under 40 CFR section 122.62(a)(1), a change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practice is a cause for modification of the permit. It is cause for revocation and reissuance if the Discharger requests or agrees.

The Central Valley Water Board may review and revise this Order at any time upon application of any affected person or the Central Valley Water Board's own motion.

- c. If a toxic effluent standard or prohibition (including any scheduled compliance specified in such effluent standard or prohibition) is established under section 307(a) of the CWA, or amendments thereto, for a toxic pollutant that is present in the discharge authorized herein, and such standard or prohibition is more stringent than any limitation upon such pollutant in this Order, the Central Valley Water Board will revise or modify this Order in accordance with such toxic effluent standard or prohibition.

The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards and prohibitions within the time provided in the regulations that establish those standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified.

- d. This Order shall be modified, or alternately revoked and reissued, to comply with any applicable effluent standard or limitation issued or approved under sections 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), and 307(a)(2) of the CWA, if the effluent standard or limitation so issued or approved:
  - i. Contains different conditions or is otherwise more stringent than any effluent limitation in the Order; or
  - ii. Controls any pollutant limited in the Order.

The Order, as modified or reissued under this paragraph, shall also contain any other requirements of the CWA then applicable.

- e. The provisions of this Order are severable. If any provision of this Order is found invalid, the remainder of this Order shall not be affected.
- f. The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize any adverse effects to waters of the State or users of those waters resulting from any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order. Reasonable steps shall include such accelerated or additional monitoring as necessary to determine the nature and impact of the non-complying discharge or sludge use or disposal.
- g. The Discharger shall ensure compliance with any existing or future pretreatment standard promulgated by USEPA under section 307 of the CWA, or amendment thereto, for any discharge to the municipal system.
- h. A copy of this Order shall be maintained at the discharge facility and be available at all times to operating personnel. Key operating personnel shall be familiar with its content.
- i. Safeguard to electric power failure:
  - i. The Discharger shall provide safeguards to assure that, should there be reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the discharge shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order.
  - ii. Upon written request by the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a written description of safeguards. Such safeguards may include alternate power sources, standby generators, retention capacity, operating procedures, or other means. A description of the safeguards provided shall include an analysis of the frequency, duration, and impact of power failures experienced over the past 5 years on effluent quality and on the capability of the Discharger to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order. The adequacy of the safeguards is subject to the approval of the Central Valley Water Board.
  - iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Central Valley Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within 90 days of having been advised in writing by the Central Valley Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Central Valley Water Board and USEPA a schedule of compliance for providing safeguards such that in the event of reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the Discharger shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order. The schedule of compliance shall, upon approval of the Central Valley Water Board, become a condition of this Order.
- j. The Discharger, upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, shall file with the Board a technical report on its preventive (failsafe) and contingency (cleanup) plans for controlling accidental discharges, and for minimizing the effect of

such events. This report may be combined with that required under the Central Valley Water Board Standard Provision contained in section VI.A.2.i of this Order.

The technical report shall:

- i. Identify the possible sources of spills, leaks, untreated waste by-pass, and contaminated drainage. Loading and storage areas, power outage, waste treatment unit outage, and failure of process equipment, tanks and pipes should be considered.
- ii. Evaluate the effectiveness of present facilities and procedures and state when they became operational.
- iii. Predict the effectiveness of the proposed facilities and procedures and provide an implementation schedule containing interim and final dates when they will be constructed, implemented, or operational.

The Central Valley Water Board, after review of the technical report, may establish conditions which it deems necessary to control accidental discharges and to minimize the effects of such events. Such conditions shall be incorporated as part of this Order, upon notice to the Discharger.

- k. A publicly owned treatment works whose waste flow has been increasing, or is projected to increase, shall estimate when flows will reach hydraulic and treatment capacities of its treatment and disposal facilities. The projections shall be made in January, based on the last 3 years' average dry weather flows, peak wet weather flows and total annual flows, as appropriate. When any projection shows that capacity of any part of the facilities may be exceeded in 4 years, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by 31 January. A copy of the notification shall be sent to appropriate local elected officials, local permitting agencies and the press. Within 120 days of the notification, the Discharger shall submit a technical report showing how it will prevent flow volumes from exceeding capacity or how it will increase capacity to handle the larger flows. The Central Valley Water Board may extend the time for submitting the report.
- l. The Discharger shall submit technical reports as directed by the Executive Officer. All technical reports required herein that involve planning, investigation, evaluation, or design, or other work requiring interpretation and proper application of engineering or geologic sciences, shall be prepared by or under the direction of persons registered to practice in California pursuant to California Business and Professions Code, sections 6735, 7835, and 7835.1. To demonstrate compliance with Title 16, CCR, sections 415 and 3065, all technical reports must contain a statement of the qualifications of the responsible registered professional(s). As required by these laws, completed technical reports must bear the signature(s) and seal(s) of the registered professional(s) in a manner such that all work can be clearly attributed to the professional responsible for the work.
- m. The Central Valley Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.
- n. For publicly owned treatment works, prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that results in a permanent decrease of flow in any portion of a watercourse, the Discharger must file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for such a change. (Water Code section 1211).

- o. In the event of any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger, the Discharger shall notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, a copy of which shall be immediately forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board.

To assume operation under this Order, the succeeding owner or operator must apply in writing to the Executive Officer requesting transfer of the Order. The request must contain the requesting entity's full legal name, the state of incorporation if a corporation, address and telephone number of the persons responsible for contact with the Central Valley Water Board and a statement. The statement shall comply with the signatory and certification requirements in the federal Standard Provisions (Attachment D, section V.B) and state that the new owner or operator assumes full responsibility for compliance with this Order. Failure to submit the request shall be considered a discharge without requirements, a violation of the Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

- p. Failure to comply with provisions or requirements of this Order, or violation of other applicable laws or regulations governing discharges from this facility, may subject the Discharger to administrative or civil liabilities, criminal penalties, and/or other enforcement remedies to ensure compliance. Additionally, certain violations may subject the Discharger to civil or criminal enforcement from appropriate local, state, or federal law enforcement entities.
- q. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, effluent limitation, discharge specification, receiving water limitation, or groundwater limitation of this Order, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by telephone (916) 464-3291 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within five days, unless the Central Valley Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall state the nature, time, duration, and cause of noncompliance, and shall describe the measures being taken to remedy the current noncompliance and prevent recurrence including, where applicable, a schedule of implementation. Other noncompliance requires written notification as above at the time of the normal monitoring report.

**B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements**

The Discharger shall comply with the MRP, and future revisions thereto, in Attachment E.

**C. Special Provisions**

**1. Reopener Provisions**

- a. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 CFR section 122.62, including, but not limited to:
  - i. If new or amended applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to section 303 of the CWA, or amendments thereto, this permit may be reopened and modified in accordance with the new or amended standards.
  - ii. When new information, that was not available at the time of permit issuance, would have justified different permit conditions at the time of issuance.
- b. This Order may be reopened for modification, or revocation and reissuance, as a result of the detection of a reportable priority pollutant generated by special conditions included in this Order. These special conditions may be, but are not

limited to, fish tissue sampling, whole effluent toxicity, monitoring requirements on internal waste stream(s), and monitoring for surrogate parameters. Additional requirements may be included in this Order as a result of the special condition monitoring data.

- c. **Mercury.** If mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted, this Order shall be reopened and the mass effluent limitation modified (higher or lower) or an effluent concentration limitation imposed. If the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for Dischargers subject to a NPDES permit, then this Order may be reopened to reevaluate the mercury mass loading limitation(s) and the need for a mercury offset program for the Discharger.
- d. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), this Order may be reopened to include a numeric or narrative chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if the State Water Board revises the SIP's toxicity control provisions that would require the establishment of numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation based on the new provisions.
- e. **Water Effects Ratios (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable when developing effluent limitations for copper. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
- f. **Drinking Water Policy.** On 26 July 2013 the Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution No. R5-2013-0098 amending the Basin Plan and establishing a Drinking Water Policy. The State Water Board approved the Drinking Water Policy on 3 December 2013. This Order may be reopened to incorporate monitoring of drinking water constituents to implement the Drinking Water Policy.
- g. **Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos Basin Plan Amendment.** Central Valley Water Board staff is developing a Basin Plan Amendment to provide an implementation plan for NPDES-permitted domestic wastewater dischargers. This Order may be reopened to modify diazinon and chlorpyrifos effluent limitations, as appropriate, in accordance with an amendment to the Basin Plan.
- h. **Cyanide.** This Order may be reopened and modified as necessary if monitoring results indicate that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard.
- i. **M&T Irrigation Canal Outfall.** Discharges to the M&T Irrigation Canal is prohibited until the Discharger provides information necessary to determine appropriate waste discharge requirements in order to protect public health and water quality. This Order may be reopened and modified as necessary to reinstate the M&T Irrigation Canal Outfall as a permitted discharge location subject to limitations and other applicable regulatory requirements for waste discharge, or as a delivery of recycled water.
- j. **Public Access Control.** If the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water determines that recycled water requirements or specific site use conditions are required to allow public access to the disposal ponds, this Order may

be reopened to add or modify findings, specifications, limits, or other conditions as appropriate.

- k. **Zinc.** This Order may be reopened and modified as necessary if monitoring results indicate that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard.

## 2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. **Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Requirements.** For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct chronic whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing, as specified in MRP section V. Furthermore, this Provision requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge exceeds the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring established in this Provision, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan, and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent recurrence of toxicity. A TRE is a site-specific study conducted in a stepwise process to identify the source(s) of toxicity and the effective control measures for effluent toxicity. TREs are designed to identify the causative agents and sources of whole effluent toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of the toxicity control options, and confirm the reduction in effluent toxicity. This Provision includes requirements for the Discharger to develop and submit a TRE Workplan and includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation.
  - i. **Initial Investigative TRE Workplan. Within 90 days of the effective date of this Order,** the Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE Workplan for approval by the Executive Officer. This should be a one to two page document including, at a minimum:
    - (a) A description of the investigation and evaluation techniques that will be used to identify potential causes and sources of effluent toxicity, effluent variability, and treatment system efficiency;
    - (b) A description of the facility's methods of maximizing in-house treatment efficiency and good housekeeping practices, and a list of all chemicals used in operation of the facility; and
    - (c) A discussion of who will conduct the Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE), if necessary (e.g., an in-house expert or outside contractor).
  - ii. **Accelerated Monitoring and TRE Initiation.** When the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity monitoring, and the testing meets all test acceptability criteria, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring as required in the Accelerated Monitoring Specifications. The Discharger shall initiate a TRE to address effluent toxicity if any WET testing results exceed the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring.
  - iii. **Numeric Toxicity Monitoring Trigger.** The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger to initiate a TRE is **> 10 TU<sub>c</sub>** (where TU<sub>c</sub> = 100/NOEC). The monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to begin accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE.

- iv. **Accelerated Monitoring Specifications.** If the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity testing, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring within 14-days of notification by the laboratory of the exceedance. Accelerated monitoring shall consist of four chronic toxicity tests conducted once every two weeks using the species that exhibited toxicity. The following protocol shall be used for accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation:
- (a) If the results of four consecutive accelerated monitoring tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring. However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of a pattern of effluent toxicity, the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.
  - (b) If the source(s) of the toxicity is easily identified (e.g., temporary plant upset), the Discharger shall make necessary corrections to the facility and shall continue accelerated monitoring until four consecutive accelerated tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger. Upon confirmation that the effluent toxicity has been removed, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring.
  - (c) If the result of any accelerated toxicity test exceeds the monitoring trigger, the Discharger shall cease accelerated monitoring and begin a TRE to investigate the cause(s) of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. Within thirty (30) days of notification by the laboratory of any test result exceeding the monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring, the Discharger shall submit a TRE Action Plan to the Central Valley Water Board including, at minimum:
    - (1) Specific actions the Discharger will take to investigate and identify the cause(s) of toxicity, including a TRE WET monitoring schedule;
    - (2) Specific actions the Discharger will take to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity; and
    - (3) A schedule for these actions.
- b. **Groundwater Monitoring Well Network Installation and Characterization.** In order to determine compliance with Groundwater Limitations V.B., and in accordance with requirements set forth in section VI.C.2.c, this provision requires the Discharger to develop a groundwater monitoring network, perform monitoring, and complete water quality analyses for characterization. The Discharger must ensure there are one or more background monitoring wells and a sufficient number of designated monitoring wells downgradient of every treatment, storage, and disposal unit that does or may release waste constituents to groundwater. **Within 12 months following adoption of this Order**, the Discharger shall submit a Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation Work Plan prepared in accordance with, and including the items listed in, Attachment I, *“Requirements for Monitoring Well Installation Work Plans and Monitoring Well Installation Reports”*. All monitoring wells shall comply with the appropriate standards as described in California Well Standards Bulletin 74-

90 (June 1991) and Water Well Standards: State of California Bulletin 74-81 (December 1981), and any more stringent standards adopted by the Discharger or County pursuant to Water Code section 13801. Well installation shall be complete **no later than 18 months** following Work Plan approval by the Executive Officer.

The Discharger shall conduct groundwater monitoring for each groundwater monitoring parameter/constituent identified in the MRP, Attachment E of this Order, upon completion of well installation. After 2 years of monitoring and within **54 months of the effective date of this Order**, the Discharger shall submit a groundwater quality characterization technical report presenting, at minimum, a summary of monitoring data, calculation of the concentration of each monitored parameter/constituent in background monitoring wells, and a comparison of background groundwater quality to that in wells used to monitor the facility for each monitored parameter/constituent. Determinations presented in the technical report shall be made in accordance with requirements set forth in section VI.C.2.c and based on data from groundwater monitoring events.

In accordance with California Business and Professions Code sections 6735, 7835, and 7835.1, engineering and geologic evaluations and judgments shall be performed by or under the direction of registered professionals competent and proficient in the fields pertinent to the required activities. The technical report shall be prepared by or under the direction of appropriately qualified professional(s) and shall bear the professional's signature and stamp.

- c. **Antidegradation Reevaluation.** As part of an iterative evaluation of compliance with State Water Board Resolution 68-16, the Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California (*State Anti-Degradation Policy*), the Discharger shall submit an Antidegradation Reevaluation with its Report of Waste Discharge. The Antidegradation Reevaluation must use information obtained from the groundwater monitoring and characterization required in section VI.C.2.b, in addition to results of the land discharge and groundwater monitoring, to confirm that any groundwater degradation that has occurred as a result of Facility operations has not resulted in any exceedances of applicable groundwater water quality objectives or in any impacts to beneficial uses.

If the data indicate that exceedances of applicable groundwater water quality objectives or impacts to beneficial uses have occurred, the Discharger shall include a work plan (with an implementation schedule) to implement additional treatment or control measures to further limit any impacts from the ponds. Determination of background groundwater quality for use in the analysis shall be made using the methods described in Title 27 California Code of Regulations Section 20415(e)(10) or other method approved by the Executive Officer.

- c. **Public Access Control.** The public has historically had access to areas within the Facility immediately surrounding the evaporation/percolation final disposal ponds to view waterfowl and other birds. If public access to these areas continues, **within 6 months following the effective date of this Order**, the Discharger shall submit documentation from the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (DDW) determining whether Title 22 recycled water requirements are necessary or if site use conditions are required. If so, this Order contains a Reopener provision to establish permit conditions as appropriate.

### 3. **Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention**

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan (SEMP) Annual Update.** The Discharger shall complete and submit annual update reports demonstrating on-going effort to control, limit, or reduce salinity in the discharge in accordance with the Discharger's SEMP. The report shall address effectiveness of measures implemented utilizing historic and current monitoring data and discuss implementation of any new or modified measures, if any. Measures considered but determined impractical due to cost versus benefit or other considerations should be presented in the report. This report shall be submitted in accordance with annual reporting requirements specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E).

#### 4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

- a. **Evaporation/Percolation Disposal Ponds and Emergency Storage Pond Operating Requirements.** (i.e., M&T Pond, Southeast Pond, and Southwest Pond and the Northeast Pond operating requirements)
  - i. No waste constituent shall be released, discharged, or placed where it will cause a violation of the Groundwater Limitations of this Order.
  - ii. Wastewater treatment, storage, and disposal shall not cause pollution or a nuisance as defined by Water Code section 13050.
  - iii. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.
  - iv. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular,
    - (a) An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface.
    - (b) Weeds shall be minimized.
    - (c) Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.
  - v. Objectionable odors shall not be perceivable beyond the limits of the Facility property at an intensity that creates or threatens to create nuisance conditions.
  - vi. As a means of discerning compliance with Specification a.v., the dissolved oxygen (DO) content in the upper one foot of the ponds shall not be less than 1.0 mg/L for three consecutive weekly sampling events. If the DO in any single pond is below 1.0 mg/L for three consecutive sampling events, the Discharger shall report the findings to the Central Valley Water Board in writing within 10 days and shall include a specific plan to resolve the low DO results within 30 days.
  - vii. Wastewater contained in any unlined pond shall not have a pH less than 6.0 or greater than 9.0.
  - viii. The Discharger shall operate and maintain all ponds sufficiently to protect the integrity of containment dams and berms and prevent overtopping and/or structural failure. Unless a California-registered civil engineer certifies (based on design, construction, and conditions of operation and maintenance) that less freeboard is adequate, the operating freeboard in any pond shall never be less than two feet (measured vertically from the lowest possible point of overflow). As a means of management and to discern compliance with this requirement, the

Discharger shall install and maintain in each pond a permanent staff gauge with calibration marks that clearly show the water level at design capacity and enable determination of available operational freeboard.

- ix. Wastewater treatment, storage, and disposal ponds or structures shall have sufficient capacity to accommodate allowable wastewater flow, design seasonal precipitation, and ancillary inflow and infiltration during the winter while ensuring compliance with all requirements of this Order. Design seasonal precipitation shall be based on total annual precipitation using a return period of 100 years, distributed monthly in accordance with historical rainfall patterns.
- x. Newly constructed or rehabilitated berms or levees (excluding internal berms that separate ponds or control the flow of water within a pond) shall be designed and constructed under the supervision of a California Registered Civil Engineer.
- xi. The discharge of waste classified as “hazardous”, as defined in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 23, section 2510 et seq., to the evaporation/percolation and emergency storage ponds is prohibited.

**5. Land Application Area Requirements. Not Applicable**

**6. Water Recycling Requirements. Not Applicable**

**7. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTW’s Only)**

**a. Pretreatment Requirements**

- i. The Discharger shall be responsible and liable for the performance of all Control Authority pretreatment requirements contained in 40 C.F.R. part 403, including any subsequent regulatory revisions to 40 C.F.R. part 403. Where 40 C.F.R. part 403 or subsequent revision places mandatory actions upon the Discharger as Control Authority but does not specify a timetable for completion of the actions, the Discharger shall complete the required actions within 6 months from the issuance date of this permit or the effective date of the 40 CFR Part 403 revisions, whichever comes later. For violations of pretreatment requirements, the Discharger shall be subject to enforcement actions, penalties, fines, and other remedies by USEPA or other appropriate parties, as provided in the CWA. USEPA may initiate enforcement action against a nondomestic user for noncompliance with applicable standards and requirements as provided in the CWA.
- ii. The Discharger shall enforce the requirements promulgated under sections 307(b), 307(c), 307(d), and 402(b) of the CWA with timely, appropriate and effective enforcement actions. The Discharger shall cause all nondomestic users subject to federal categorical standards to achieve compliance no later than the date specified in those requirements or, in the case of a new nondomestic user, upon commencement of the discharge.
- iii. The Discharger shall perform the pretreatment functions as required in 40 C.F.R. part 403 including, but not limited to:
  - (a) Implement the necessary legal authorities as provided in 40 CFR section 403.8(f)(1);
  - (b) Enforce the pretreatment requirements under 40 C.F.R. section 403.5 and 403.6;
  - (c) Implement the programmatic functions as provided in 40 C.F.R. section 403.8(f)(2); and

- (d) Provide the requisite funding and personnel to implement the pretreatment program as provided in 40 C.F.R. section 403.8(f)(3).
- iv. Pretreatment Reporting Requirements. Pretreatment reporting requirements are included in the Monitoring and Reporting Program, section X.D.5 of Attachment E.
- b. **Sludge/Biosolids Treatment or Discharge Specifications.** Sludge in this document means the solid, semisolid, and liquid residues removed during primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment processes. Solid waste refers to grit and screening material generated during preliminary treatment. Residual sludge means sludge that will not be subject to further treatment at the wastewater treatment plant. Biosolids refer to sludge that has been treated and tested and shown to be capable of being beneficially and legally used pursuant to federal and state regulations as a soil amendment for agricultural, silvicultural, horticultural, and land reclamation activities as specified under 40 C.F.R. part 503.
- i. Collected screenings, residual sludge, biosolids, and other solids removed from liquid wastes shall be disposed of in a manner approved by the Executive Officer, and consistent with Consolidated Regulations for Treatment, Storage, Processing, or Disposal of Solid Waste, as set forth in Title 27, CCR, division 2, subdivision 1, section 20005, et seq. Removal for further treatment, storage, disposal, or reuse at sites (e.g., landfill, composting sites, soil amendment sites) that are operated in accordance with valid waste discharge requirements issued by a Regional Water Board will satisfy these specifications.
- Sludge and solid waste shall be removed from screens, sumps, ponds, clarifiers, etc. as needed to ensure optimal plant performance.
- The treatment of sludge generated at the Facility shall be confined to the Facility property and conducted in a manner that precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate groundwater limitations in section V.B. of this Order. In addition, the storage of residual sludge, solid waste, and biosolids on Facility property shall be temporary and controlled, and contained in a manner that minimizes leachate formation and precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate groundwater limitations included in section V.B. of this Order.
- ii. The use, disposal, storage, and transportation of biosolids shall comply with existing federal and state laws and regulations, including permitting requirements and technical standards included in 40 C.F.R. part 503. If the State Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board are given the authority to implement regulations contained in 40 C.F.R. part 503, this Order may be reopened to incorporate appropriate time schedules and technical standards. The Discharger must comply with the standards and time schedules contained in 40 C.F.R. part 503 whether or not they have been incorporated into this Order.
- iii. The Discharger shall comply with Section IX.A. Biosolids of the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E.
- iv. Any proposed change in biosolids use or disposal practice from a previously approved practice shall be reported to the Executive Officer and USEPA Regional Administrator at least **90 days** in advance of the change.

- v. **Within 180 days of the permit effective date**, the Discharger shall submit a biosolids use or disposal plan update to the Central Valley Water Board. The plan shall describe at a minimum:
  - (a) Sources and amounts of biosolids generated annually.
  - (b) Location(s) of on-site storage and description of the containment area.
  - (c) Plans for ultimate disposal. For landfill disposal, include the present classification of the landfill; and the name and location of the landfill.
- c. **Collection System.** On 2 May 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General WDR's for Sanitary Sewer Systems. The Discharger shall be subject to the requirements of Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ and any future revisions thereto. Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the general WDR's. The Discharger has applied for and has been approved for coverage under Order 2006-0003-DWQ for operation of its wastewater collection system.
- d. **Anaerobically Digestible Material.** If the Discharger proposes to receive hauled-in anaerobically digestible material for injection into an anaerobic digester for co-digestion, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board and develop and implement standard operating procedures (SOP's) for this activity prior to initiation of the hauling. The SOP's shall address material handling, including unloading, screening, or other processing prior to anaerobic digestion; transportation; spill prevention; and spill response. In addition, the SOP's shall address avoidance of the introduction of materials that could cause interference, pass-through, or upset of the treatment processes; avoidance of prohibited material, vector control, odor control, operation and maintenance, and the disposition of any solid waste segregated from introduction to the digester. The Discharger shall provide training to its staff on the SOP's and shall maintain records for a minimum of three years for each load received, describing the hauler, waste type, and quantity received. In addition, the Discharger shall maintain records for a minimum of three years for the disposition, location, and quantity of accumulated pre-digestion-segregated solid waste hauled off-site.

**8. Compliance Schedules**

- a. **Compliance Schedule for Land Discharge Specifications at Discharge Point D-002.** This Order requires compliance with Land Discharge Specifications for BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, total coliform organisms, and percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS. The Discharger shall comply with the following time schedule to ensure compliance with the Land Discharge Specifications section IV.B:

<u>Task</u>	<u>Date Due</u>
i. Submit Method of Compliance Workplan/Schedule	<b>Within 12 months</b> after adoption of this Order
ii. Progress Reports <sup>1</sup>	<b>1 February</b> , annually, after approval of work plan until full compliance is achieved.
iii. Full Compliance	<b>30 May 2021</b>

Task

Date Due

- <sup>1</sup> The progress reports shall detail what steps have been implemented towards achieving compliance with waste discharge requirements, including studies, construction progress, evaluation of measures implemented, and recommendations for additional measures as necessary to achieve full compliance by the final compliance date.

## VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

- A. BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.a, IV.A.1.b, IV.B.1.a, and IV.B.1.b).** Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.a and IV.B.1.a shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples. Compliance with effluent limitations required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.1.b and IV.B.1.b for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS in effluent samples collected over a monthly period as a percentage of the arithmetic mean of the values for influent samples collected at approximately the same times during the same period.
- B. Average Dry Weather Flow Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.f).** The average dry weather discharge flow represents the daily average flow when groundwater is at or near normal and runoff is not occurring. Compliance with the average dry weather flow effluent limitations will be determined annually based on the average daily flow over three consecutive dry weather months (e.g., July, August, and September).
- C. Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.e).** For each day that an effluent sample is collected and analyzed for total coliform organisms, the 7-day median shall be determined by calculating the median concentration of total coliform bacteria in the effluent utilizing the bacteriological results of the last 7 days. For example, if a sample is collected on a Wednesday, the result from that sampling event and all results from the previous 6 days (i.e., Tuesday, Monday, Sunday, Saturday, Friday, and Thursday) are used to calculate the 7-day median. If the 7-day median of total coliform organisms exceeds a most probable number (MPN) of 23 per 100 milliliters, the Discharger will be considered out of compliance.
- D. Total Residual Chlorine Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.d).** Continuous monitoring analyzers for chlorine residual or for dechlorination agent residual in the effluent are appropriate methods for compliance determination. A positive residual dechlorination agent in the effluent indicates that chlorine is not present in the discharge, which demonstrates compliance with the effluent limitations. This type of monitoring can also be used to prove that some chlorine residual exceedances are false positives. Continuous monitoring data showing either a positive dechlorination agent residual or a chlorine residual at or below the prescribed limit are sufficient to show compliance with the total residual chlorine effluent limitations, as long as the instruments are maintained and calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations.

Any excursion above the 1-hour average or 4-day average total residual chlorine effluent limitations is a violation. If the Discharger conducts continuous monitoring and the Discharger can demonstrate, through data collected from a back-up monitoring system, that a chlorine spike recorded by the continuous monitor was not actually due to chlorine, then any excursion resulting from the recorded spike will not be considered an exceedance, but rather reported as a false positive. Records supporting validation of false positives shall be maintained in accordance with Section IV Standard Provisions (Attachment D).

- E. Mass Effluent Limitations.** The mass effluent limitations contained in the Final Effluent Limitations IV.A.1.a are based on the permitted average dry weather flow and calculated as follows:

Mass (lbs/day) = Flow (MGD) x Concentration (mg/L) x 8.34 (conversion factor)

If the effluent flow exceeds the permitted average dry weather flow during wet-weather seasons, the effluent mass limitations contained in Final Effluent Limitations IV.A.1.a shall not apply. If the effluent flow is below the permitted average dry weather flow during wet-weather seasons, the effluent mass limitations do apply.

**F. Priority Pollutant Effluent Limitations.** Compliance with effluent limitations for priority pollutants shall be determined in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of the SIP, as follows:

1. Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent limitation, if the concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the reporting level (RL).
2. Dischargers shall be required to conduct a Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP) in accordance with section 2.4.5.1 of the SIP when there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either:
  - a. A sample result is reported as detected, but not quantified (DNQ) and the effluent limitation is less than the RL; or
  - b. A sample result is reported as non-detect (ND) and the effluent limitation is less than the method detection limit (MDL).
3. When determining compliance with an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and more than one sample result is available in a month, the discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of DNQ or ND. In those cases, the discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:
  - a. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
  - b. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.
4. If a sample result, or the arithmetic mean or median of multiple sample results, is below the RL, and there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and the discharger conducts a PMP (as described in section 2.4.5.1), the discharger shall not be deemed out of compliance.

**G. Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitation (Section V.A.5.a-c).** Monthly receiving water monitoring is required in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) and is sufficient to evaluate the impacts of the discharge and compliance with this Order. Monthly receiving water monitoring data, measured at monitoring locations RSW-001 and RSW-002, will be used to determine compliance with part "c" of the dissolved oxygen receiving water limitation to ensure the discharge does not cause the dissolved oxygen concentrations in the Sacramento River to be reduced below <7.0 mg/L at any time. However, should more frequent dissolved oxygen and temperature receiving water monitoring be conducted, Central Valley Water Board staff may evaluate compliance with parts "a" and "b".

## ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

### Arithmetic Mean ( $\mu$ )

Also called the average, is the sum of measured values divided by the number of samples. For ambient water concentrations, the arithmetic mean is calculated as follows:

Arithmetic mean =  $\mu = \Sigma x / n$                       where:  $\Sigma x$  is the sum of the measured ambient water concentrations, and  $n$  is the number of samples.

### Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

The highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar month divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that month.

### Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL)

The highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar week (Sunday through Saturday), calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar week divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that week.

### Bioaccumulative

Those substances taken up by an organism from its surrounding medium through gill membranes, epithelial tissue, or from food and subsequently concentrated and retained in the body of the organism.

### Carcinogenic

Pollutants are substances that are known to cause cancer in living organisms.

### Coefficient of Variation (CV)

CV is a measure of the data variability and is calculated as the estimated standard deviation divided by the arithmetic mean of the observed values.

### Daily Discharge

Daily Discharge is defined as either: (1) the total mass of the constituent discharged over the calendar day (12:00 am through 11:59 pm) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling (as specified in the permit), for a constituent with limitations expressed in units of mass or; (2) the unweighted arithmetic mean measurement of the constituent over the day for a constituent with limitations expressed in other units of measurement (e.g., concentration).

The daily discharge may be determined by the analytical results of a composite sample taken over the course of one day (a calendar day or other 24-hour period defined as a day) or by the arithmetic mean of analytical results from one or more grab samples taken over the course of the day.

For composite sampling, if 1 day is defined as a 24-hour period other than a calendar day, the analytical result for the 24-hour period will be considered as the result for the calendar day in which the 24-hour period ends.

### Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)

DNQ are those sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL. Sample results reported as DNQ are estimated concentrations.

### Dilution Credit

Dilution Credit is the amount of dilution granted to a discharge in the calculation of a water quality-based effluent limitation, based on the allowance of a specified mixing zone. It is calculated from the dilution ratio or determined through conducting a mixing zone study or modeling of the discharge and receiving water.

**Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA)**

ECA is a value derived from the water quality criterion/objective, dilution credit, and ambient background concentration that is used, in conjunction with the coefficient of variation for the effluent monitoring data, to calculate a long-term average (LTA) discharge concentration. The ECA has the same meaning as waste load allocation (WLA) as used in U.S. EPA guidance (Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control, March 1991, second printing, EPA/505/2-90-001).

**Enclosed Bays**

Enclosed Bays means indentations along the coast that enclose an area of oceanic water within distinct headlands or harbor works. Enclosed bays include all bays where the narrowest distance between the headlands or outermost harbor works is less than 75 percent of the greatest dimension of the enclosed portion of the bay. Enclosed bays include, but are not limited to, Humboldt Bay, Bodega Harbor, Tomales Bay, Drake's Estero, San Francisco Bay, Morro Bay, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, Upper and Lower Newport Bay, Mission Bay, and San Diego Bay. Enclosed bays do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

**Estimated Chemical Concentration**

The estimated chemical concentration that results from the confirmed detection of the substance by the analytical method below the ML value.

**Estuaries**

Estuaries means waters, including coastal lagoons, located at the mouths of streams that serve as areas of mixing for fresh and ocean waters. Coastal lagoons and mouths of streams that are temporarily separated from the ocean by sandbars shall be considered estuaries. Estuarine waters shall be considered to extend from a bay or the open ocean to a point upstream where there is no significant mixing of fresh water and seawater. Estuarine waters included, but are not limited to, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, as defined in Water Code section 12220, Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait downstream to the Carquinez Bridge, and appropriate areas of the Smith, Mad, Eel, Noyo, Russian, Klamath, San Diego, and Otay rivers. Estuaries do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

**Inland Surface Waters**

All surface waters of the state that do not include the ocean, enclosed bays, or estuaries.

**Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation**

The highest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous maximum limitation).

**Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation**

The lowest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous minimum limitation).

**Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)**

The highest allowable daily discharge of a pollutant, over a calendar day (or 24-hour period). For pollutants with limitations expressed in units of mass, the daily discharge is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the day. For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurement, the daily discharge is calculated as the arithmetic mean measurement of the pollutant over the day.

**Median**

The middle measurement in a set of data. The median of a set of data is found by first arranging the measurements in order of magnitude (either increasing or decreasing order). If the number of

measurements (n) is odd, then the median =  $X_{(n+1)/2}$ . If n is even, then the median =  $(X_{n/2} + X_{(n/2)+1})/2$  (i.e., the midpoint between the n/2 and n/2+1).

**Method Detection Limit (MDL)**

MDL is the minimum concentration of a substance that can be measured and reported with 99 percent confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero, as defined in in 40 C.F.R. part 136, Attachment B, revised as of July 3, 1999.

**Minimum Level (ML)**

ML is the concentration at which the entire analytical system must give a recognizable signal and acceptable calibration point. The ML is the concentration in a sample that is equivalent to the concentration of the lowest calibration standard analyzed by a specific analytical procedure, assuming that all the method specified sample weights, volumes, and processing steps have been followed.

**Mixing Zone**

Mixing Zone is a limited volume of receiving water that is allocated for mixing with a wastewater discharge where water quality criteria can be exceeded without causing adverse effects to the overall water body.

**Not Detected (ND)**

Sample results which are less than the laboratory's MDL.

**Ocean Waters**

The territorial marine waters of the State as defined by California law to the extent these waters are outside of enclosed bays, estuaries, and coastal lagoons. Discharges to ocean waters are regulated in accordance with the State Water Board's California Ocean Plan.

**Persistent Pollutants**

Persistent pollutants are substances for which degradation or decomposition in the environment is nonexistent or very slow.

**Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)**

PMP means waste minimization and pollution prevention actions that include, but are not limited to, product substitution, waste stream recycling, alternative waste management methods, and education of the public and businesses. The goal of the PMP shall be to reduce all potential sources of a priority pollutant(s) through pollutant minimization (control) strategies, including pollution prevention measures as appropriate, to maintain the effluent concentration at or below the water quality-based effluent limitation. Pollution prevention measures may be particularly appropriate for persistent bioaccumulative priority pollutants where there is evidence that beneficial uses are being impacted. The Central Valley Water Board may consider cost effectiveness when establishing the requirements of a PMP. The completion and implementation of a Pollution Prevention Plan, if required pursuant to Water Code section 13263.3(d), shall be considered to fulfill the PMP requirements.

**Pollution Prevention**

Pollution Prevention means any action that causes a net reduction in the use or generation of a hazardous substance or other pollutant that is discharged into water and includes, but is not limited to, input change, operational improvement, production process change, and product reformulation (as defined in Water Code section 13263.3). Pollution prevention does not include actions that merely shift a pollutant in wastewater from one environmental medium to another environmental medium, unless clear environmental benefits of such an approach are identified to the satisfaction of the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) or Central Valley Water Board.

**Satellite Collection System**

The portion, if any, of a sanitary sewer system owned or operated by a different public agency than the agency that owns and operates the wastewater treatment facility that a sanitary sewer system is tributary to.

**Source of Drinking Water**

Any water designated as municipal or domestic supply (MUN) in a Central Valley Water Board Basin Plan.

**Standard Deviation ( $\sigma$ )**

Standard Deviation is a measure of variability that is calculated as follows:

$$\sigma = (\sum[(x - \mu)^2]/(n - 1))^{0.5}$$

where:

x is the observed value;


$\mu$  is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and

n is the number of samples.

**Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)**


TRE is a study conducted in a step-wise process designed to identify the causative agents of effluent or ambient toxicity, isolate the sources of toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of toxicity control options, and then confirm the reduction in toxicity. The first steps of the TRE consist of the collection of data relevant to the toxicity, including additional toxicity testing, and an evaluation of facility operations and maintenance practices, and best management practices. A Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) may be required as part of the TRE, if appropriate. (A TIE is a set of procedures to identify the specific chemical(s) responsible for toxicity. These procedures are performed in three phases (characterization, identification, and confirmation) using aquatic organism toxicity tests.)

ATTACHMENT B – MAP



# ATTACHMENT C – FLOW SCHEMATIC

H:\Client\Chico\_SAC\676641\Draw\O&M FIGURES\Fig-2.1 REV 8-04-09 04:57pm BAlvender XREFS: Carollo-Logo; Carollo-Logo;



CITY OF CHICO

## ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS

### I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

#### A. Duty to Comply

1. The Discharger must comply with all of the terms, requirements, and conditions of this Order. Any noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code and is grounds for enforcement action; permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; denial of a permit renewal application; or a combination thereof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a); Wat. Code, §§ 13261, 13263, 13265, 13268, 13000, 13001, 13304, 13350, 13385.)
2. The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the CWA for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under Section 405(d) of the CWA within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a)(1).)

#### B. Need to Halt or Reduce Activity Not a Defense

It shall not be a defense for a Discharger in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(c).)

#### C. Duty to Mitigate

The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(d).)

#### D. Proper Operation and Maintenance

The Discharger shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the Discharger to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. Proper operation and maintenance also includes adequate laboratory controls and appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of backup or auxiliary facilities or similar systems that are installed by a Discharger only when necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(e).)

#### E. Property Rights

1. This Order does not convey any property rights of any sort or any exclusive privileges. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(g).)
2. The issuance of this Order does not authorize any injury to persons or property or invasion of other private rights, or any infringement of state or local law or regulations. (40 C.F.R. § 122.5(c).)

#### F. Inspection and Entry

The Discharger shall allow the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. EPA, and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon the presentation of credentials and other documents, as may be required by law, to (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i); Wat. Code, § 13267, 13383):

1. Enter upon the Discharger's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records are kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(1); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);
2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this Order (33 U.S.C. § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(2); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383);
3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B)(ii); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(3); Wat. Code, § 13267, 13383); and
4. Sample or monitor, at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring Order compliance or as otherwise authorized by the CWA or the Water Code, any substances or parameters at any location. (33 U.S.C § 1318(a)(4)(B); 40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(4); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383.)

## **G. Bypass**

1. Definitions
  - a. "Bypass" means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(i).)
  - b. "Severe property damage" means substantial physical damage to property, damage to the treatment facilities, which causes them to become inoperable, or substantial and permanent loss of natural resources that can reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of a bypass. Severe property damage does not mean economic loss caused by delays in production. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(ii).)
2. Bypass not exceeding limitations. The Discharger may allow any bypass to occur which does not cause exceedances of effluent limitations, but only if it is for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3, I.G.4, and I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(2).)
3. Prohibition of bypass. Bypass is prohibited, and the Central Valley Water Board may take enforcement action against a Discharger for bypass, unless (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)):
  - a. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(A));
  - b. There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass that occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(B)); and
  - c. The Discharger submitted notice to the Central Valley Water Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C).)
4. The Central Valley Water Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Central Valley Water Board determines that it will meet the three

conditions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3 above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(ii).)

5. Notice

- a. Anticipated bypass. If the Discharger knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit a notice, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(i).)
- b. Unanticipated bypass. The Discharger shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Standard Provisions - Reporting V.E below (24-hour notice). (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(ii).)

**H. Upset**

Upset means an exceptional incident in which there is unintentional and temporary noncompliance with technology based permit effluent limitations because of factors beyond the reasonable control of the Discharger. An upset does not include noncompliance to the extent caused by operational error, improperly designed treatment facilities, inadequate treatment facilities, lack of preventive maintenance, or careless or improper operation. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(1).)

1. Effect of an upset. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.H.2 below are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(2).)
2. Conditions necessary for a demonstration of upset. A Discharger who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence that (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)):
  - a. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(i));
  - b. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(ii));
  - c. The Discharger submitted notice of the upset as required in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.E.2.b below (24-hour notice) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and
  - d. The Discharger complied with any remedial measures required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.C above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iv).)
3. Burden of proof. In any enforcement proceeding, the Discharger seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(4).)

**II. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION**

**A. General**

This Order may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the Discharger for modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any Order condition. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(f).)

**B. Duty to Reapply**

If the Discharger wishes to continue an activity regulated by this Order after the expiration date of this Order, the Discharger must apply for and obtain a new permit. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(b).)

**C. Transfers**

This Order is not transferable to any person except after notice to the Central Valley Water Board. The Central Valley Water Board may require modification or revocation and reissuance of the Order to change the name of the Discharger and incorporate such other requirements as may be necessary under the CWA and the Water Code. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(3); 122.61.)

**III. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING**

- A.** Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(1).)
- B.** Monitoring results must be conducted according to test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 for the analyses of pollutants unless another method is required under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O. In the case of pollutants for which there are no approved methods under 40 C.F.R. part 136 or otherwise required under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O, monitoring must be conducted according to a test procedure specified in this Order for such pollutants. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(4); 122.44(i)(1)(iv).)

**IV. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS**

- A.** Except for records of monitoring information required by this Order related to the Discharger's sewage sludge use and disposal activities, which shall be retained for a period of at least five years (or longer as required by 40 C.F.R. part 503), the Discharger shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this Order, and records of all data used to complete the application for this Order, for a period of at least three (3) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer at any time. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(2).)
- B.** Records of monitoring information shall include:
  - 1. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(i));
  - 2. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(ii));
  - 3. The date(s) analyses were performed (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iii));
  - 4. The individual(s) who performed the analyses (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iv));
  - 5. The analytical techniques or methods used (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(v)); and
  - 6. The results of such analyses. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(vi).)
- C.** Claims of confidentiality for the following information will be denied (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)):
  - 1. The name and address of any permit applicant or Discharger (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(1)); and
  - 2. Permit applications and attachments, permits and effluent data. (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(2).)

**V. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING**

**A. Duty to Provide Information**

The Discharger shall furnish to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA within a reasonable time, any information which the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this Order or to determine compliance with this Order. Upon request, the Discharger shall also furnish to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA copies of records required to be kept by this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(h); Wat. Code, §§ 13267, 13383.)

## **B. Signatory and Certification Requirements**

1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, and/or U.S. EPA shall be signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, V.B.3, V.B.4, and V.B.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(k).)
2. All permit applications shall be signed by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this provision, a principal executive officer of a federal agency includes: (i) the chief executive officer of the agency, or (ii) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency (e.g., Regional Administrators of U.S. EPA). (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(3).)
3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA shall be signed by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:
  - a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(1));
  - b. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. (A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position.) (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(2)); and
  - c. The written authorization is submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(3).)
4. If an authorization under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications, to be signed by an authorized representative. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(c).)
5. Any person signing a document under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 or V.B.3 above shall make the following certification:

“I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(d).)

### **C. Monitoring Reports**

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4).)
2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board for reporting results of monitoring of sludge use or disposal practices. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i).)
3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136, or another method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Central Valley Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(ii).)
4. Calculations for all limitations, which require averaging of measurements, shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(iii).)

### **D. Compliance Schedules**

Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this Order, shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(5).)

### **E. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting**

1. The Discharger shall report any noncompliance that may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. A written submission shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i).)
2. The following shall be included as information that must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)):
  - a. Any unanticipated bypass that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(A).)
  - b. Any upset that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(B).)
3. The Central Valley Water Board may waive the above-required written report under this provision on a case-by-case basis if an oral report has been received within 24 hours. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(iii).)

### **F. Planned Changes**

The Discharger shall give notice to the Central Valley Water Board as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility. Notice is required under this provision only when (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)):

1. The alteration or addition to a permitted facility may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in section 122.29(b) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(i)); or

2. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants that are subject neither to effluent limitations in this Order nor to notification requirements under section 122.42(a)(1) (see Additional Provisions—Notification Levels VII.A.1). (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(ii).)
3. The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practices, and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in the existing permit, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(iii).)

**G. Anticipated Noncompliance**

The Discharger shall give advance notice to the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity that may result in noncompliance with this Order's requirements. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(2).)

**H. Other Noncompliance**

The Discharger shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.C, V.D, and V.E above at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in Standard Provision – Reporting V.E above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(7).)

**I. Other Information**

When the Discharger becomes aware that it failed to submit any relevant facts in a permit application, or submitted incorrect information in a permit application or in any report to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA, the Discharger shall promptly submit such facts or information. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(8).)

**VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT**

- A.** The Central Valley Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.

**VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS**

**A. Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTW's)**

All POTW's shall provide adequate notice to the Central Valley Water Board of the following (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)):

1. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger that would be subject to sections 301 or 306 of the CWA if it were directly discharging those pollutants (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(1)); and
2. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of adoption of the Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(2).)
3. Adequate notice shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent introduced into the POTW as well as any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(3).)

## ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

### Contents

I.	General Monitoring Provisions .....	E-2
II.	Monitoring Locations .....	E-3
III.	Influent Monitoring Requirements.....	E-3
	A. Monitoring Location INF-001 .....	E-3
IV.	Effluent Monitoring Requirements .....	E-4
	A. Monitoring Location EFF-001 .....	E-4
V.	Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements .....	E-5
VI.	Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements .....	E-7
	A. Monitoring Location LND-001 .....	E-7
	B. Monitoring Locations PND-001, PND-002, PND-003, and PND-004 .....	E-8
VII.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements .....	E-8
	A. Monitoring Location RSW-001 and RSW-002 .....	E-8
	B. Monitoring Location GW-001 through GW-0XX.....	E-9
VIII.	Other Monitoring Requirements .....	E-10
	A. Biosolids .....	E-10
	B. Municipal Water Supply .....	E-11
	C. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization .....	E-11
IX.	Reporting Requirements .....	E-15
	A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements .....	E-15
	B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs) .....	E-15
	C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR's).....	E-18
	D. Other Reports .....	E-18

### Tables

Table E-1.	Monitoring Station Locations .....	E-3
Table E-2.	Influent Monitoring .....	E-4
Table E-3.	Effluent Monitoring.....	E-4
Table E-4.	Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series.....	E-6
Table E-5.	Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements .....	E-8
Table E-6.	Pond Monitoring Requirements .....	E-8
Table E-7.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements (RSW-001/002) .....	E-8
Table E-8.	Groundwater Monitoring Requirements .....	E-10
Table E-9.	Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements.....	E-11
Table E-10.	Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Monitoring .....	E-11
Table E-11.	Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule.....	E-16
Table E-12.	Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Reports.....	E-18

## **ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MRP)**

The Code of Federal Regulations (40 C.F.R. § 122.48) requires that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. This MRP establishes monitoring and reporting requirements that implement federal and California regulations.

### **I. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS**

- A.** Samples and measurements taken as required herein shall be representative of the volume and nature of the monitored discharge. All samples shall be taken at the monitoring locations specified below and, unless otherwise specified, before the monitored flow joins or is diluted by any other waste stream, body of water, or substance. Monitoring locations shall not be changed without notification to and the approval of the Central Valley Water Board.
- B.** Effluent samples shall be taken downstream of the last addition of wastes to the treatment or discharge works where a representative sample may be obtained prior to mixing with the receiving waters. Samples shall be collected at such a point and in such a manner to ensure a representative sample of the discharge.
- C.** Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses of any material required by this Order shall be conducted by a laboratory certified for such analyses by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Division of Drinking Water (DDW; formerly the Department of Public Health). Laboratories that perform sample analyses must be identified in all monitoring reports submitted to the Central Valley Water Board. In the event a certified laboratory is not available to the Discharger for any onsite field measurements such as pH, dissolved oxygen (DO), turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine, such analyses performed by a noncertified laboratory will be accepted provided a Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program is instituted by the laboratory. A manual containing the steps followed in this program for any onsite field measurements such as pH, DO, turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine must be kept onsite in the treatment facility laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Central Valley Water Board staff. The Discharger must demonstrate sufficient capability (qualified and trained employees, properly calibrated and maintained field instruments, etc.) to adequately perform these field measurements. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to USEPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Central Valley Water Board.
- D.** Appropriate flow measurement devices and methods consistent with accepted scientific practices shall be selected and used to ensure the accuracy and reliability of measurements of the volume of monitored discharges. All monitoring instruments and devices used by the Discharger to fulfill the prescribed monitoring program shall be properly maintained and calibrated as necessary, at least yearly, to ensure their continued accuracy. All flow measurement devices shall be calibrated at least once per year to ensure continued accuracy of the devices.
- E.** Monitoring results, including noncompliance, shall be reported at intervals and in a manner specified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- F.** Laboratories analyzing monitoring samples shall be certified by DDW, in accordance with the provision of Water Code section 13176, and must include quality assurance/quality control data with their reports.
- G.** The Discharger shall ensure that the results of the Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study or the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study are submitted annually to the State Water Resources Control Board at the following address:

State Water Resources Control Board Quality Assurance Program Officer

- H. The Discharger shall file with the Central Valley Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- I. The results of all monitoring required by this Order shall be reported to the Central Valley Water Board, and shall be submitted in such a format as to allow direct comparison with the limitations and requirements of this Order. Unless otherwise specified, discharge flows shall be reported in terms of the monthly average and the daily maximum discharge flows.

**II. MONITORING LOCATIONS**

The Discharger shall establish the following monitoring locations to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitations, discharge specifications, and other requirements in this Order:

**Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations**

Discharge Point Name	Monitoring Location Name	Monitoring Location Description
--	INF-001	Influent monitoring location, at headworks
D-001	EFF-001	Downstream from the last connection through which wastes can be admitted to the outfall before being discharged to the Sacramento River Latitude: 121° 57' N Longitude: 39° 42'W
D-002	LND-001	Land discharge monitoring location downstream from last connection through which wastes can be admitted before being discharged to the M&T Pond. (Note: The M&T Pond discharges to the Southeast Pond and Southwest Pond)
--	RSW-001	Surface water monitoring location, 500 feet upstream from D-001 Latitude: 121° 57' N Longitude: 39° 42'W
--	RSW-002	Surface water monitoring location, 500 feet downstream from D-001 Latitude: 121° 57' N Longitude: 39° 42'W
--	PND-001	The M&T Pond, evaporation/percolation final disposal pond
--	PND-002	The Southeast Pond, evaporation/percolation final disposal pond
--	PND-003	The Southwest Pond, evaporation/percolation final disposal pond
	PND-004	Northeast Pond, emergency storage pond
	SPL-001	Municipal water supply
--	BIO-001	A location where a representative sample of biosolids can be collected
--	GW-001 through GW-0XX <sup>1</sup>	Groundwater monitoring wells

<sup>1</sup> To be established after monitoring well installation in accordance with Provisions section VI.C.2.b

The North latitude and West longitude information in Table E-1 are approximate for administrative purposes.

**III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

**A. Monitoring Location INF-001**

- 1. The Discharger shall monitor influent to the Facility at INF-001 as follows:

**Table E-2. Influent Monitoring**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--
pH	standard units	Grab <sup>3</sup>	1/Week	1
Biochemical Oxygen Demand(5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>2</sup>	1/Week	1
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>2</sup>	1/Week	1
Temperature	°F	Grab <sup>3</sup>	1/Week	1

<sup>1</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR part 136; or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

<sup>2</sup> 24-hour flow proportional composite. If existing equipment cannot provide a flow proportional composite sample based upon real-time continuous flow metering, then a time-weighted composite sampling procedure that uses continuous flow measurements to achieve a comparable result may be utilized. (Note: Any new composite sampling equipment to be installed at the Facility to demonstrate compliance with regulatory requirements must be capable of providing 24-hour flow proportional composite samples).

<sup>3</sup> Grab samples shall not be collected at the same time each day to get a complete representation of variations in the influent.

**IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

**A. Monitoring Location EFF-001**

1. The Discharger shall monitor secondary treated effluent at EFF-001 as follows. If more than one analytical test method is listed for a given parameter, the Discharger must select from the listed methods and corresponding Minimum Level:

**Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20° C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>2</sup>	1/Week	1
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Week	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>2</sup>	1/Week	1
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Week	--
pH	standard units	Meter	Continuous <sup>3</sup>	1
<b>Priority Pollutants</b>				
Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern	See Section VIII.D	See Section VIII.D	See Section VIII.D	1, 5
<b>Non-Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>3, 6</sup>	1
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Month	1
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	Grab	1/Month	
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	Grab	1/Month	
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	Meter	Continuous	1,7
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Week	1
Hardness, Total (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>8</sup>	1
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>9</sup>	1
Nitrite Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month <sup>9</sup>	1

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Temperature	°C	Grab	1/Week <sup>3,4</sup>	1
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	1/Week <sup>10</sup>	1
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	1
Cyanide, Total (as CN)	µg/L	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>11</sup>	1
Zinc, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>11</sup>	1

<sup>1</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

<sup>2</sup> 24-hour flow proportional composite. If existing equipment cannot provide a flow proportional composite sample based upon real-time continuous flow metering, then a time-weighted composite sampling procedure that uses continuous flow measurements to achieve a comparable result may be utilized. (Note: Any new composite sampling equipment to be installed at the Facility to demonstrate compliance with regulatory requirements must be capable of providing 24-hour flow proportional composite samples).

<sup>3</sup> pH and temperature shall be recorded at the time of ammonia sample collection.

<sup>4</sup> A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a USEPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.

<sup>5</sup> For priority pollutant constituents the reporting level shall be consistent with Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (See Attachment E, section VIII.D).

<sup>6</sup> Concurrent with whole effluent toxicity monitoring

<sup>7</sup> Total chlorine residual must be monitored with a method sensitive to and accurate at the permitted level of 0.01 mg/L.

<sup>8</sup> Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.

<sup>9</sup> Monitoring for nitrite and nitrate shall be conducted concurrently.

<sup>10</sup> Samples for total coliform organisms may be collected at any point following disinfection.

<sup>11</sup> Sampling to be performed for 8 consecutive quarters only during the term of this Order.

## V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS

**A. Acute Toxicity Testing.** The Discharger shall conduct acute toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing acute toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following acute toxicity testing requirements:

1. Monitoring Frequency – The Discharger shall perform **quarterly** acute toxicity testing, concurrent with effluent ammonia sampling.
2. Sample Types – The Discharger may use flow-through or static renewal testing. For static renewal testing, the samples shall be flow proportional **24-hour composites** and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location **EFF-001**.
3. Test Species – Test species shall be rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*).
4. Methods – The acute toxicity testing samples shall be analyzed using EPA-821-R-02-012, Fifth Edition. Temperature, total residual chlorine, and pH shall be recorded at the time of sample collection. No pH adjustment may be made unless approved by the Executive Officer.
5. Test Failure – If an acute toxicity test does not meet all test acceptability criteria, as specified in the test method, the Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, not to exceed 7 days following notification of test failure.

**B. Chronic Toxicity Testing.** The Discharger shall conduct three species chronic toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing chronic toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

1. Monitoring Frequency – The Discharger shall perform **annual** three species chronic toxicity testing.
2. Sample Types – Effluent samples shall be flow proportional **24-hour composites** and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location **EFF-001**. The receiving water control shall be a grab sample obtained from Monitoring Location **RSW-001**, as identified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
3. Sample Volumes – Adequate sample volumes shall be collected to provide renewal water to complete the test in the event that the discharge is intermittent.
4. Test Species – Chronic toxicity testing measures sublethal (e.g., reduced growth, reproduction) and/or lethal effects to test organisms exposed to an effluent compared to that of the control organisms. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity tests with:
  - a. The cladoceran, water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (survival and reproduction test);
  - b. The fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas* (larval survival and growth test); and
  - c. The green alga, *Selenastrum capricornutum* (growth test).
5. Methods – The presence of chronic toxicity shall be estimated as specified in *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002.
6. Reference Toxicant – As required by the SIP, all chronic toxicity tests shall be conducted with concurrent testing with a reference toxicant and shall be reported with the chronic toxicity test results.
7. Dilutions – For routine and accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, it is not necessary to perform the test using a dilution series. The test may be performed using 100% effluent and one control. For TRE monitoring, the chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in Table E-4, below, unless an alternative dilution series is detailed in the submitted TRE Action Plan. A receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

**Table E-4. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series**

Sample	Dilutions <sup>a</sup> (%)						Control
	100	75	50	25	10	5	
% Effluent	100	75	50	25	10	5	0
% Control Water	0	25	50	75	90	95	100

<sup>a</sup> Receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

8. Test Failure – The Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, but no later than fourteen (14) days after receiving notification of a test failure. A test failure is defined as follows:
  - a. The reference toxicant test or the effluent test does not meet all test acceptability criteria as specified in the *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002 (Method Manual), and its subsequent amendments or revisions; or

- b. The percent minimum significant difference (PMSD) measured for the test exceeds the upper PMSD bound variability criterion in Table 6 on page 52 of the Method Manual. (A retest is only required in this case if the test results do not exceed the monitoring trigger specified in the Special Provision at section VI. 2.a.iii. of the Order.)

**C. WET Testing Notification Requirements.** The Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board within 24-hours after the receipt of test results exceeding the monitoring trigger during regular or accelerated monitoring, or an exceedance of the acute toxicity effluent limitation.

**D. WET Testing Reporting Requirements.** All toxicity test reports shall include the contracting laboratory's complete report provided to the Discharger and shall be in accordance with the appropriate "Report Preparation and Test Review" sections of the method manuals. At a minimum, whole effluent toxicity monitoring shall be reported as follows:

1. **Chronic WET Reporting.** Regular chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be reported to the Central Valley Water Board with the **annual** self-monitoring report, and shall contain, at minimum:

- a. The results expressed in TUc, measured as 100/NOEC, and also measured as 100/LC50, 100/EC25, 100/IC25, and 100/IC50, as appropriate.
- b. The statistical methods used to calculate endpoints;
- c. The statistical output page, which includes the calculation of the percent minimum significant difference (PMSD);
- d. The dates of sample collection and initiation of each toxicity test; and
- e. The results compared to the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger.

Additionally, the **annual** self-monitoring reports shall contain an updated chronology of chronic toxicity test results expressed in TUc, and organized by test species, type of test (survival, growth or reproduction), and monitoring frequency, i.e., either quarterly, monthly, accelerated, or Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE).

2. **Acute WET Reporting.** Acute toxicity test results shall be submitted with the monthly discharger self-monitoring reports and reported as percent survival.

3. **TRE Reporting.** Reports for TREs shall be submitted in accordance with the schedule contained in the Discharger's approved TRE Workplan, or as amended by the Discharger's TRE Action Plan.

4. **Quality Assurance (QA).** The Discharger must provide the following information for QA purposes:

- a. Results of the applicable reference toxicant data with the statistical output page giving the species, NOEC, LOEC, type of toxicant, dilution water used, concentrations used, PMSD, and dates tested.
- b. The reference toxicant control charts for each endpoint, which include summaries of reference toxicant tests performed by the contracting laboratory.
- c. Any information on deviations or problems encountered and how they were dealt with.

## **VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

### **A. Monitoring Location LND-001**

1. The Discharger shall monitor secondary treated effluent at LND-001 as follows:

**Table E-5. Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--
<b>Conventional Pollutants</b>				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20° C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>2</sup>	1/Week <sup>5</sup>	1
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Week <sup>5</sup>	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite <sup>2</sup>	1/Week <sup>5</sup>	1
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Week <sup>5</sup>	--
pH	standard units	Meter	1/Day <sup>3,5</sup>	1
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	1/Week <sup>4,5</sup>	1

<sup>1</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

<sup>2</sup> 24-hour flow proportional composite. If existing equipment cannot provide a flow proportional composite sample based upon real-time continuous flow metering, then a time-weighted composite sampling procedure that uses continuous flow measurements to achieve a comparable result may be utilized. (Note: Any new composite sampling equipment to be installed at the Facility to demonstrate compliance with regulatory requirements must be capable of providing 24-hour flow proportional composite samples).

<sup>3</sup> A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a USEPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.

<sup>4</sup> Samples for total coliform organisms may be collected at any point following disinfection.

<sup>5</sup> Sampling to begin once Discharger has constructed improvements necessary to comply with Land Discharge Specifications section IV.B.1.a-b.

**B. Monitoring Locations PND-001, PND-002, PND-003, and PND-004**

- The Discharger shall monitor the M&T Pond (PND-001), Southeast Pond (PND-002), Southwest Pond (PND-003), and the Northeast Pond (PND-004) as follows:

**Table E-6. Pond Monitoring Requirements**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Freeboard	Feet, inches	Observation	1/Week	--
Odors <sup>1</sup>	--	Observation	1/Week	--
Other field parameters <sup>2</sup>	--	Observation	1/Week	--

<sup>1</sup> The Discharger shall keep a log of pond conditions. Attention shall be given to the presence or absence of odors. Notes regarding observation of odors shall be summarized in the self-monitoring report.

<sup>2</sup> The Discharger shall keep a log of pond conditions. Attention shall be given to the presences or absence of dead algae, vegetation, weeds, debris, and erosion or other structural failures. Notes regarding pond conditions shall be summarized in the self-monitoring report.

**VII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

**A. Monitoring Location RSW-001 and RSW-002**

- The Discharger shall monitor the Sacramento River at RSW-001 and RSW-002 as follows:

**Table E-7. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements (RSW-001/002)**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
pH	Standard units	Grab <sup>2</sup>	1/Month	1
Turbidity	NTU	Grab <sup>2</sup>	1/Month	1
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab <sup>2</sup>	1/Month	1
Temperature	°F	Grab <sup>2</sup>	1/Month	1
Electrical Conductivity @ 25 °C	µmhos/cm	Grab <sup>2</sup>	1/Month	1
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab <sup>2,5</sup>	1/Month	1
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab <sup>2,5</sup>	1/Month	1
Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern <sup>3</sup>	See Section VIII.D	See Section VIII.D	See Section VIII.D <sup>4</sup>	1
Copper, Dissolved	µg/L	Grab <sup>2,5</sup>	1/Quarter	1
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	Grab <sup>2,5</sup>	1/Quarter	1
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	Grab <sup>2,5</sup>	1/Quarter	1
Hardness, Total (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/L	Grab <sup>2</sup>	1/Quarter	1
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab <sup>2,5</sup>	1/Quarter	1
Cyanide	µg/L	Grab <sup>2,5</sup>	1/Quarter	1
Nitrate plus nitrite	mg/L	Grab <sup>2,5</sup>	1/Quarter	1

<sup>1</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

<sup>2</sup> A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a USEPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.

<sup>3</sup> For priority pollutant constituents the reporting level shall be consistent with Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (See Attachment E, section VIII.D).

<sup>4</sup> Sampling for priority pollutants shall be performed quarterly in accordance with Attachment E, section VIII in the third year of the term of this Order.

<sup>5</sup> RSW-001 only

2. In conducting the receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions throughout the reach bounded by Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002. Attention shall be given to the presence or absence of:

- a. Floating or suspended matter;
- b. Discoloration;
- c. Bottom deposits;
- d. Aquatic life;
- e. Visible films, sheens, or coatings;
- f. Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths;
- g. Potential nuisance conditions.

Notes on the receiving water conditions shall be summarized in the monitoring report.

#### **B. Monitoring Location GW-001 through GW-0XX**

1. Prior to construction and/or beginning a sampling program of any new groundwater monitoring wells, the Discharger shall submit plans and specifications to the Central Valley Water Board for approval. Once installed, all new wells shall be added to the

monitoring network and shall be sampled and analyzed according to the schedule below. All samples shall be collected using approved EPA methods. Water table elevations shall be calculated to determine groundwater gradient and direction of flow.

2. The methods of analysis and the detection limits used must be appropriate for the expected concentrations. For the monitoring of any constituent or parameter that is found in concentrations which produce more than 90% non-numerical determinations (i.e., “trace” or “ND”) in data from background monitoring points for that medium, the analytical method having the lowest method detection limit (MDL) shall be selected from among those methods which would provide valid results in light of any matrix effects or interferences.
3. Prior to sampling, the groundwater elevations shall be measured and the wells shall be purged of at least three well volumes until temperature, pH, and electrical conductivity have stabilized. Depth to groundwater shall be measured to the nearest 0.01 feet. Groundwater monitoring at any new groundwater monitoring wells shall include, at a minimum, the following:

**Table E-8. Groundwater Monitoring Requirements**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Depth to Groundwater	±0.01 feet	Measurement	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	--
Groundwater Elevation <sup>1</sup>	±0.01 feet	Calculated	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	--
Gradient	feet/feet	Calculated	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	--
Gradient Direction	degrees	Calculated	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	--
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
Fixed Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
pH	standard units	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
Total Nitrogen	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
Nitrate Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
Ammonia (as NH <sub>4</sub> )	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	mg/L	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2</sup>
Standard Minerals <sup>3</sup>	µg/L	Grab	1/Quarter <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Groundwater elevation shall be determined based on depth-to-water measurements from a surveyed measuring point elevation on the well. The groundwater elevation shall be used to calculate the direction and gradient of groundwater flow, which must be reported.

<sup>2</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

<sup>3</sup> Standard minerals shall include the following: boron, calcium, iron, magnesium, potassium, sodium, chloride, manganese, phosphorus, total alkalinity (including alkalinity series), and hardness, and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

<sup>4</sup> Minimum sampling frequency shall be 1/Quarter for the first eight consecutive quarters (i.e., 2 years). Thereafter, the minimum sampling frequency shall be reduced to semi-annual (i.e., 2/year).

## VIII. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

### A. Biosolids

#### 1. Monitoring Location BIO-001

- a. A composite sample of sludge shall be collected **annually** at Monitoring Location BIO-001 in accordance with EPA's *POTW Sludge Sampling and Analysis*

*Guidance Document*, August 1989, and tested for priority pollutants listed in 40 C.F.R. part 122, Appendix D, Tables II and III (excluding total phenols).

- b. Biosolids monitoring shall be conducted using the methods in Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical methods (EPA publication SW-846), as required in 40 C.F.R. section 503.8(b)(4). All results must be reported on a 100% dry weight basis. Records of all analyses must state on each page of the laboratory report whether the results are expressed in “100% dry weight” or “as is.”
- c. Sampling records shall be retained for a minimum of 5 years. A log shall be maintained of sludge quantities generated and of handling and disposal activities. The frequency of entries is discretionary; however, the log must be complete enough to serve as a basis for part of the annual report.

## B. Municipal Water Supply

### 1. Monitoring Location SPL-001

- a. The Discharger shall monitor the municipal water supply at SPL-001 as follows:

**Table E-9. Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements**

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Total Dissolved Solids <sup>1</sup>	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	<sup>2</sup>
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C <sup>1</sup>	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Year	<sup>2</sup>
Standard Minerals <sup>3</sup>	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> If the water supply is from more than one source, the total dissolved solids and electrical conductivity shall be reported as a weighted average and include copies of supporting calculations.

<sup>2</sup> Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R. part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

<sup>3</sup> Standard minerals shall include all major cations and anions and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

## C. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization

1. **Quarterly Monitoring.** Quarterly samples shall be collected from the effluent and upstream receiving water (Monitoring Locations EFF-001 and RSW-001) and analyzed for the constituents listed in Table E-10, below. Quarterly monitoring shall be conducted during **2019** (4 consecutive samples, evenly distributed throughout the year) and the results of such monitoring be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board with the monthly self-monitoring reports. Each individual monitoring event shall provide representative sample results for the effluent and upstream receiving water.
2. **Concurrent Sampling.** Effluent and receiving water sampling shall be performed at approximately the same time, on the same date.
3. **Sample Type.** All receiving water samples shall be taken as grab samples. Effluent samples shall be taken as described in **Table E-10**, below.

**Table E-10. Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Monitoring**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
2- Chloroethyl vinyl ether	µg/L	Grab	1
Acrolein	µg/L	Grab	2
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	Grab	2
Benzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
Bromoform	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Carbon Tetrachloride	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Chloroform	µg/L	Grab	2
Chloromethane	µg/L	Grab	2
Dichloromethane	µg/L	Grab	2
Ethylbenzene	µg/L	Grab	2
Hexachlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	1
Hexachlorobutadiene	µg/L	Grab	1
Hexachloroethane	µg/L	Grab	1
Methyl bromide (Bromomethane)	µg/L	Grab	1
Naphthalene	µg/L	Grab	10
3-Methyl-4-Chlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	
Tetrachloroethene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Toluene	µg/L	Grab	2
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	µg/L	Grab	1
Trichloroethene	µg/L	Grab	2
Vinyl chloride	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	µg/L	Grab	
Trichlorofluoromethane	µg/L	Grab	
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1-dichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1-dichloroethylene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2-dichloropropane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,3-dichloropropylene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-Trifluoroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2,4-trichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	1
1,2-dichloroethane	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,2-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,3-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
1,4-dichlorobenzene	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Styrene	µg/L	Grab	
Xylenes	µg/L	Grab	
1,2-Benzanthracene	µg/L	Grab	5
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	Grab	1
2-Chlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dichlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dimethylphenol	µg/L	Grab	2
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	Grab	5
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
2,6-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	Grab	5
2-Nitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	10
2-Chloronaphthalene	µg/L	Grab	10
3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	µg/L	Grab	5
3,4-Benzofluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	µg/L	Grab	5
4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Nitrophenol	µg/L	Grab	10

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	Grab	10
4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	µg/L	Grab	5
Acenaphthene	µg/L	Grab	1
Acenaphthylene	µg/L	Grab	10
Anthracene	µg/L	Grab	10
Benzidine	µg/L	Grab	5
Benzo(a)pyrene (3,4-Benzopyrene)	µg/L	Grab	2
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	µg/L	Grab	5
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	2
Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane	µg/L	Grab	5
Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether	µg/L	Grab	1
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether	µg/L	Grab	10
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	µg/L	Grab	5
Butyl benzyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Chrysene	µg/L	Grab	5
Di-n-butylphthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Di-n-octylphthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Dibenzo(a,h)-anthracene	µg/L	Grab	0.1
Diethyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Dimethyl phthalate	µg/L	Grab	10
Fluoranthene	µg/L	Grab	10
Fluorene	µg/L	Grab	10
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	µg/L	Grab	5
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	µg/L	Grab	0.05
Isophorone	µg/L	Grab	1
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	µg/L	Grab	1
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	µg/L	Grab	5
N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	µg/L	Grab	5
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	Grab	10
Pentachlorophenol	µg/L	Grab	1
Phenanthrene	µg/L	Grab	5
Phenol	µg/L	Grab	1
Pyrene	µg/L	Grab	10
Aluminum	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Antimony	µg/L	24-hr Composite	5
Arsenic	µg/L	24-hr Composite	10
Asbestos	MFL	24-hr Composite	
Barium	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Beryllium	µg/L	24-hr Composite	2
Cadmium	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
Chromium (Total)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	10
Chromium (VI)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	10
Fluoride	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Iron	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Lead	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
Mercury	µg/L	Grab	0.5
Manganese	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Molybdenum	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Nickel	µg/L	24-hr Composite	20
Selenium	µg/L	24-hr Composite	5
Silver	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.25
Thallium	µg/L	24-hr Composite	1

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
Tributyltin	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Zinc	µg/L	24-hr Composite	20
4,4'-DDD	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.05
4,4'-DDE	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.05
4,4'-DDT	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
alpha-Endosulfan	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.02
alpha-Hexachlorocyclohexane (BHC)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Alachlor	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Aldrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.005
beta-Endosulfan	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
beta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.005
Chlordane	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.1
delta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.005
Dieldrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Endosulfan sulfate	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Endrin	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Endrin Aldehyde	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Heptachlor	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.01
Heptachlor Epoxide	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.02
Lindane (gamma-Hexachlorocyclohexane)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1016	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1221	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1232	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1242	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1248	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1254	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
PCB-1260	µg/L	24-hr Composite	0.5
Toxaphene	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Atrazine	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Bentazon	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Carbofuran	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
2,4-D	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Dalapon	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Dinoseb	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Diquat	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Endothal	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Ethylene Dibromide	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Methoxychlor	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Molinate (Ordram)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Oxamyl	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Picloram	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Simazine (Princep)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Thiobencarb	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Diazinon	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Chlorpyrifos	µg/L	24-hr Composite	

Parameter	Units	Effluent Sample Type	Maximum Reporting Level <sup>1</sup>
Boron	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Chloride	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Flow	MGD	Meter	
Hardness (as CaCO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/L	Grab	
Foaming Agents (MBAS)	µg/L	24-hr Composite	
Mercury, Methyl	ng/L	Grab	
pH	Std Units	Grab	
Phosphorus, Total (as P)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Specific conductance (EC)	µmhos/cm	24-hr Composite	
Sulfate	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Sulfide (as S)	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Sulfite (as SO <sub>3</sub> )	mg/L	24-hr Composite	
Temperature	°C	Grab	

<sup>1</sup> The reporting levels required in this table for priority pollutant constituents are established based on Section 2.4.2 and Appendix 4 of the SIP.

<sup>2</sup> In order to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant.

<sup>3</sup> The Discharger is not required to conduct effluent monitoring for constituents that have already been sampled in a given month, as required in Table E-3, except for hardness, pH, and temperature, which shall be conducted concurrently with the effluent sampling.

<sup>4</sup> 24-hour flow proportional composite.

## IX. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

### A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions (Attachment D) related to monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping.
2. Upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a summary monitoring report. The report shall contain both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year(s).
3. **Compliance Time Schedules.** For compliance time schedules included in the Order, the Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board, on or before each compliance due date, the specified document or a written report detailing compliance or noncompliance with the specific date and task. If noncompliance is reported, the Discharger shall state the reasons for noncompliance and include an estimate of the date when the Discharger will be in compliance. The Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by letter when it returns to compliance with the compliance time schedule.
4. The Discharger shall report to the Central Valley Water Board any toxic chemical release data it reports to the State Emergency Response Commission within 15 days of reporting the data to the Commission pursuant to section 313 of the "*Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act*" of 1986.

### B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs)

1. The Discharger shall electronically submit SMRs using the State Water Board's California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program Web site (<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html>). The CIWQS Web site will provide additional information for SMR submittal in the event there will be a planned service interruption for electronic submittal.

2. The Discharger shall report in the SMR the results for all monitoring specified in this MRP under sections III through IX. The Discharger shall submit **monthly, quarterly, and annual** SMRs including the results of all required monitoring using U.S. EPA-approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. SMRs are to include all new monitoring results obtained since the last SMR was submitted. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculations and reporting of the data submitted in the SMR.
3. Monitoring periods and reporting for all required monitoring shall be completed according to the following schedule:

**Table E-11. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule**

<b>Sampling Frequency</b>	<b>Monitoring Period Begins On...</b>	<b>Monitoring Period</b>	<b>SMR Due Date</b>
Continuous	Permit effective date	All	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Day	Permit effective date	(Midnight through 11:59 PM) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling.	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Month	Permit effective date	1 <sup>st</sup> day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling
1/Quarter	Permit effective date	1 January through 31 March 1 April through 30 June 1 July through 30 September 1 October through 31 December	1 May 1 August 1 November 1 February of following year
1/Year	Permit effective date	1 January through 31 December	1 February of following year

4. **Reporting Protocols.** The Discharger shall report with each sample result the applicable Reporting Level (RL) and the current laboratory's Method Detection Limit (MDL), as determined by the procedure in 40 C.F.R. part 136.

The Discharger shall report the results of analytical determinations for the presence of chemical constituents in a sample using the following reporting protocols:

- a. Sample results greater than or equal to the RL shall be reported as measured by the laboratory (i.e., the measured chemical concentration in the sample).
- b. Sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL, shall be reported as "Detected, but Not Quantified," or DNQ. The estimated chemical concentration of the sample shall also be reported.

For the purposes of data collection, the laboratory shall write the estimated chemical concentration next to DNQ. The laboratory may, if such information is available, include numerical estimates of the data quality for the reported result. Numerical estimates of data quality may be percent accuracy ( $\pm$  a percentage of the reported value), numerical ranges (low to high), or any other means considered appropriate by the laboratory.

- c. Sample results less than the laboratory's MDL shall be reported as "Not Detected," or ND.
  - d. Dischargers are to instruct laboratories to establish calibration standards so that the Minimum Level (ML) value (or its equivalent if there is differential treatment of samples relative to calibration standards) is the lowest calibration standard. At no time is the Discharger to use analytical data derived from extrapolation beyond the lowest point of the calibration curve.
5. **Multiple Sample Data.** When determining compliance with an AMEL, AWEL, or MDEL for priority pollutants and more than one sample result is available, the Discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of "Detected, but Not Quantified" (DNQ) or "Not Detected" (ND). In those cases, the Discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:
- a. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, ranking the reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
  - b. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.
6. The Discharger shall submit SMRs in accordance with the following requirements:
- a. The Discharger shall arrange all reported data in a tabular format. The data shall be summarized to clearly illustrate whether the facility is operating in compliance with interim and/or final effluent limitations. The Discharger is not required to duplicate the submittal of data that is entered in a tabular format within CIWQS. When electronic submittal of data is required and CIWQS does not provide for entry into a tabular format within the system, the Discharger shall electronically submit the data in a tabular format as an attachment.
  - b. The Discharger shall attach a cover letter to the SMR. The information contained in the cover letter shall clearly identify violations of the WDR's; discuss corrective actions taken or planned; and the proposed time schedule for corrective actions. Identified violations must include a description of the requirement that was violated and a description of the violation.
  - c. The Discharger shall attach all laboratory analysis sheets, including quality assurance/quality control information, with all its SMRs for which sample analyses were performed.
7. The Discharger shall submit in the SMRs calculations and reports in accordance with the following requirements:
- a. **Calendar Annual Average Limitations.** For constituents with effluent limitations specified as "calendar annual average" (electrical conductivity) the Discharger shall report the calendar annual average in the December SMR. The annual average shall be calculated as the average of the samples gathered for the calendar year.
  - b. **Mass Loading Limitations.** For BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, and ammonia, the Discharger shall calculate and report the mass loading (lbs/day) in the SMRs. The mass loading shall be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Mass Loading (lbs/day)} = \text{Flow (MGD)} \times \text{Concentration (mg/L)} \times 8.34$$

When calculating daily mass loading, the daily average flow and constituent concentration shall be used. For weekly average mass loading, the weekly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used. For monthly average mass loading, the monthly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used.

- c. **Removal Efficiency (BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS).** The Discharger shall calculate and report the percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS in the SMRs. The percent removal shall be calculated as specified in section VII.A. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.
- d. **Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the 7-day median of total coliform organisms for the effluent. The 7 day median of total coliform organisms shall be calculated as specified in Compliance Determination section VII.C.
- e. **Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall report monthly in the self-monitoring report the dissolved oxygen concentrations in the effluent (EFF-001) and the receiving water (RSW-001 and RSW-002).
- f. **Turbidity Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the turbidity increase in the receiving water applicable to the natural turbidity condition specified in section V.A.17.a-e. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.
- g. **Temperature Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the temperature increase in the receiving water based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002.

### C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR's)

1. The Discharger shall electronically submit DMR's together with SMR's using Electronic Self-Monitoring Reports module eSMR 2.5 or any upgraded version. Electronic submittal of DMR's will be in addition to electronic submittal of SMRs. Information about electronic submittal of DMR's is provided by the Discharge Monitoring Report website as follows: ([http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/discharge\\_monitoring/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/discharge_monitoring/)).

### D. Other Reports

1. **Special Study Reports and Progress Reports.** As specified in the compliance time schedules required in the Special Provisions contained in section VI of the Order, special study and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the following reporting requirements. At minimum, the progress reports shall include a discussion of the status of final compliance, whether the Discharger is on schedule to meet the final compliance date, and the remaining tasks to meet the final compliance date.

**Table E-12. Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Reports**

Special Provision	Reporting Requirements
Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation, Work Plan (Specials Provision section VI.C.2.b)	<b>Within 12 months</b> following adoption of Order
Groundwater Quality Characterization, Final Report (Special Provisions section VI.C.2.b)	<b>Within 54 months</b> following effective date of Order
Antidegradation Reevaluation, Final Report (Special Provisions section VI.C.2.c)	<b>Within 180 days</b> of the expiration date of Order (with Report of Waste Discharge)

Special Provision	Reporting Requirements
Public Access Control. (If required, see Special Provisions section VI.C.2.e)	<b>Within 6 months</b> following effective date of Order
SEMP Annual Update (Special Provisions section VI.C.3.a)	<b>Annually</b> , due 1 February of each year
Land Discharge Specifications Annual Progress Report (Special Provisions section VI.C.8.a)	<b>Annually</b> , due 1 February of each year
Land Discharge Specifications, Work Plan (Special Provisions section VI.C.8.a)	<b>Within 12 months</b> following the effective date of Order

2. The Discharger shall report the results of any special studies, acute and chronic toxicity testing, TRE/TIE, PMP, and Pollution Prevention Plan required by Special Provisions – VI.C. The Discharger shall report the progress in satisfaction of compliance schedule dates specified in Special Provisions – VI.C.7. The Discharger shall submit reports in compliance with SMR reporting requirements described in subsection X.B above.
3. **Within 60 days of permit adoption**, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining reporting levels (RL's), method detection limits (MDL's), and analytical methods for the constituents listed in tables E-2, E-3, E-5, and E-7 through E-10. In addition, no less than 6 months prior to conducting the effluent and receiving water characterization monitoring required in Section VIII.C, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining RL's, MDL's, and analytical methods for the constituents listed in Table E-10. The Discharger shall comply with the monitoring and reporting requirements for CTR constituents as outlined in section 2.3 and 2.4 of the SIP. The maximum required reporting levels for priority pollutant constituents shall be based on the Minimum Levels (ML's) contained in Appendix 4 of the SIP, determined in accordance with Section 2.4.2 and Section 2.4.3 of the SIP. In accordance with Section 2.4.2 of the SIP, when there is more than one ML value for a given substance, the Central Valley Water Board shall include as RL's, in the permit, all ML values, and their associated analytical methods, listed in Appendix 4 that are below the calculated effluent limitation. The Discharger may select any one of those cited analytical methods for compliance determination. If no ML value is below the effluent limitation, then the Central Valley Water Board shall select as the RL, the lowest ML value, and its associated analytical method, listed in Appendix 4 for inclusion in the permit. **Table E-10** provides required maximum reporting levels in accordance with the SIP.
4. **Annual Operations Report. By 1 February of each year**, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Executive Officer containing the following:
  - a. The names, certificate grades, and general responsibilities of all persons employed at the Facility.
  - b. The names and telephone numbers of persons to contact regarding the plant for emergency and routine situations.
  - c. A statement certifying when the flow meter(s) and other monitoring instruments and devices were last calibrated, including identification of who performed the calibration.
  - d. A statement certifying whether the current operation and maintenance manual, and contingency plan, reflect the wastewater treatment plant as currently constructed and operated, and the dates when these documents were last revised and last reviewed for adequacy.

- e. The Discharger may also be requested to submit an annual report to the Central Valley Water Board with both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year. Any such request shall be made in writing. The report shall discuss the compliance record. If violations have occurred, the report shall also discuss the corrective actions taken and planned to bring the discharge into full compliance with the waste discharge requirements.
5. **Annual Pretreatment Reporting Requirements.** The Discharger shall submit annually a report to the Central Valley Water Board, with copies to USEPA Region 9 and the State Water Board, describing the Discharger's pretreatment activities over the previous 12 months (1 January through 31 December). In the event that the Discharger is not in compliance with any conditions or requirements of this Order, including noncompliance with pretreatment audit/compliance inspection requirements, then the Discharger shall also include the reasons for noncompliance and state how and when the Discharger shall comply with such conditions and requirements.

**An annual report shall be submitted by 28 February** and include at least the following items:

- a. A summary of analytical results from representative, flow proportioned, 24-hour composite sampling of the POTW's influent and effluent for those pollutants USEPA has identified under section 307(a) of the CWA which are known or suspected to be discharged by nondomestic users. This will consist of an annual full priority pollutant scan. The Discharger is not required to sample and analyze for asbestos. The Discharger shall submit the results of the annual priority pollutant scan electronically to the Central Valley Water Board using the State Water Board's CIWQS Program Website.

Sludge shall be sampled during the same 24-hour period and analyzed for the same pollutants as the influent and effluent sampling and analysis. The sludge analyzed shall be a composite sample of a minimum of 12 discrete samples taken at equal time intervals over the 24-hour period. Wastewater and sludge sampling and analysis shall be performed at least annually. The Discharger shall also provide any influent, effluent or sludge monitoring data for nonpriority pollutants which may be causing or contributing to Interference, Pass-Through or adversely impacting sludge quality. Sampling and analysis shall be performed in accordance with the techniques prescribed in 40 C.F.R. part 136 and amendments thereto.

- b. A discussion of Upset, Interference, or Pass-Through incidents, if any, at the treatment plant, which the Discharger knows or suspects were caused by nondomestic users of the POTW. The discussion shall include the reasons why the incidents occurred, the corrective actions taken and, if known, the name and address of, the nondomestic user(s) responsible. The discussion shall also include a review of the applicable pollutant limitations to determine whether any additional limitations, or changes to existing requirements, may be necessary to prevent Pass-Through, Interference, or noncompliance with sludge disposal requirements.
- c. The cumulative number of nondomestic users that the Discharger has notified regarding Baseline Monitoring Reports and the cumulative number of nondomestic user responses.
- d. An updated list of the Discharger's significant industrial users (SIUs) including their names and addresses, or a list of deletions, additions and SIU name changes keyed to a previously submitted list. The Discharger shall provide a brief explanation for each change. The list shall identify the SIUs subject to federal categorical standards by specifying which set(s) of standards are applicable to each SIU. The list shall

indicate which SIUs, or specific pollutants from each industry, are subject to local limitations. Local limitations that are more stringent than the federal categorical standards shall also be identified.

- e. The Discharger shall characterize the compliance status through the year of record of each SIU by employing the following descriptions:
  - i. complied with baseline monitoring report requirements (where applicable);
  - ii. consistently achieved compliance;
  - iii. inconsistently achieved compliance;
  - iv. significantly violated applicable pretreatment requirements as defined by 40 C.F.R. section 403.8(f)(2)(vii);
  - v. complied with schedule to achieve compliance (include the date final compliance is required);
  - vi. did not achieve compliance and not on a compliance schedule; and
  - vii. compliance status unknown.
- f. A report describing the compliance status of each SIU characterized by the descriptions in items iii through vii above shall be submitted for each calendar quarter by the first day of the second month following the end of the quarter. The report shall identify the specific compliance status of each such SIU and shall also identify the compliance status of the POTW with regards to audit/pretreatment compliance inspection requirements. If none of the aforementioned conditions exist, at a minimum, a letter indicating that all industries are in compliance and no violations or changes to the pretreatment program have occurred during the quarter must be submitted. The information required in the fourth quarter report shall be included as part of the annual report due every 28 February. This quarterly reporting requirement shall commence upon issuance of this Order.
- g. A summary of the inspection and sampling activities conducted by the Discharger during the past year to gather information and data regarding the SIUs. The summary shall include:
  - i. The names and addresses of the SIUs subjected to surveillance and an explanation of whether they were inspected, sampled, or both and the frequency of these activities at each user; and
  - ii. The conclusions or results from the inspection or sampling of each industrial user.
- h. The Discharger shall characterize the compliance status of each SIU by providing a list or table which includes the following information:
  - i. Name of SIU;
  - ii. Category, if subject to federal categorical standards;
  - iii. The type of wastewater treatment or control processes in place;
  - iv. The number of samples taken by the POTW during the year;
  - v. The number of samples taken by the SIU during the year;
  - vi. For an SIU subject to discharge requirements for total toxic organics, whether all required certifications were provided;
  - vii. A list of the standards violated during the year. Identify whether the violations were for categorical standards or local limits.

- viii. Whether the facility is in significant noncompliance (SNC) as defined at 40 C.F.R. section 403.8(f)(2)(viii) at any time during the year; and
- ix. A summary of enforcement or other actions taken during the year to return the SIU to compliance. Describe the type of action (e.g., warning letters or notices of violation, administrative orders, civil actions, and criminal actions), final compliance date, and the amount of fines and penalties collected, if any. Describe any proposed actions for bringing the SIU into compliance;
- x. Restriction of flow to the POTW.
- xi. Disconnection from discharge to the POTW.
- i. A brief description of any programs the POTW implements to reduce pollutants from nondomestic users that are not classified as SIUs;
- j. A brief description of any significant changes in operating the pretreatment program which differ from the previous year including, but not limited to, changes concerning: the program's administrative structure, local limits, monitoring program or monitoring frequencies, legal authority, enforcement policy, funding levels, or staffing levels;
- k. A summary of the annual pretreatment budget, including the cost of pretreatment program functions and equipment purchases; and
- l. A summary of activities to involve and inform the public of the program including a copy of the newspaper notice, if any, required under 40 C.F.R. section 403.8(f)(2)(viii).

Pretreatment Program reports shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and the:

State Water Resources Control Board  
Division of Water Quality  
1001 I Street or P.O. Box 100  
Sacramento, CA 95812

and the

Regional Administrator  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency WTR-5  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

## ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

### Contents

I.	Permit Information.....	F-3
II.	Facility Description.....	F-4
	A. Compliance Summary.....	F-5
	B. Planned Changes.....	F-6
III.	Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations.....	F-6
	A. Legal Authorities.....	F-6
	B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).....	F-6
	C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans.....	F-6
	D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List.....	F-9
	E. Other Plans, Polices and Regulations.....	F-9
IV.	Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications.....	F-10
	A. Discharge Prohibitions.....	F-11
	B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-11
	1. Scope and Authority.....	F-11
	2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-12
	C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL's).....	F-12
	1. Scope and Authority.....	F-12
	2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives.....	F-13
	3. Determining the Need for WQBEL's.....	F-25
	4. WQBEL Calculations.....	F-39
	5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET).....	F-41
	D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations.....	F-43
	1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations.....	F-43
	2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations.....	F-43
	3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements.....	F-44
	4. Antidegradation Policies.....	F-44
	5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants.....	F-45
	E. Land Discharge Specifications.....	F-46
	F. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable.....	F-47
V.	Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations.....	F-47
	A. Surface Water.....	F-47
	B. Groundwater.....	F-47
VI.	Rationale for Provisions.....	F-48
	A. Standard Provisions.....	F-48
	B. Special Provisions.....	F-48
	1. Reopener Provisions.....	F-48
	2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements.....	F-49
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention.....	F-53
	4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications.....	F-53
	5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTW's Only).....	F-53
	6. Compliance Schedules.....	F-55
VII.	Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements.....	F-55
	A. Influent Monitoring.....	F-55
	B. Effluent Monitoring.....	F-55
	C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements.....	F-56
	D. Receiving Water Monitoring.....	F-56
	1. Surface Water.....	F-56
	2. Groundwater.....	F-57

E. Other Monitoring Requirements .....	F-57
VIII. Public Participation.....	F-58
A. Notification of Interested Parties .....	F-58
B. Written Comments .....	F-58
C. Public Hearing .....	F-59
D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements .....	F-59
E. Information and Copying.....	F-59
F. Register of Interested Persons.....	F-59
G. Additional Information .....	F-59

**Tables**

Table F-1. Facility Information.....	F-3
Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data.....	F-5
Table F-3. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses .....	F-7
Table F-4. 303 (d) List for the Sacramento River .....	F-9
Table F-5. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations .....	F-12
Table F-6. Dilution Credits Associated with Performance-based Effluent Limitations .....	F-16
Table F-7. Summary of CTR Criteria for Hardness-dependent Metals .....	F-20
Table F-8. Verification of CTR Compliance for Copper .....	F-25
Table F-9. Verification of CTR Compliance for Silver .....	F-25
Table F-10. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations.....	F-40
Table F-11. Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results.....	F-42
Table F-12. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations.....	F-46

## ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

As described in section II.B of this Order, the Central Valley Water Board incorporates this Fact Sheet as findings of the Central Valley Water Board supporting the issuance of this Order. This Fact Sheet includes the legal requirements and technical rationale that serve as the basis for the requirements of this Order.

This Order has been prepared under a standardized format to accommodate a broad range of discharge requirements for Dischargers in California. Only those sections or subsections of this Order that are specifically identified as “not applicable” have been determined not to apply to this Discharger. Sections or subsections of this Order not specifically identified as “not applicable” are fully applicable to this Discharger.

### I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the Facility.

**Table F-1. Facility Information**

WDID	5A040102001
CIWQS Facility Place ID	271805
Discharger	City of Chico
Name of Facility	Chico Water Pollution Control Plant
Facility Address	4827 Chico River Road
	Chico, CA 95927
	Butte County
Facility Contact, Title and Phone	James Carr, Wastewater Treatment Manager, (530) 894-4300
Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports	James Carr, Wastewater Treatment Manager, (530) 894-4301
Mailing Address	SAME
Billing Address	SAME
Type of Facility	POTW
Major or Minor Facility	Major
Threat to Water Quality	1
Complexity	A
Pretreatment Program	Yes
Recycling Requirements	N/A
Facility Permitted Flow	12 million gallons per day (based on ADWF)
Facility Design Flow	12 million gallons per day (based on ADWF)
Watershed	Sacramento
Receiving Water	Sacramento River
Receiving Water Type	Inland surface water

- A.** The City of Chico (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of the Chico Water Pollution Control Plant (hereinafter Facility), a Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTW).

For the purposes of this Order, references to the “discharger” or “permittee” in applicable federal and state laws, regulations, plans, or policy are held to be equivalent to references to the Discharger herein.

- B.** The Facility discharges treated wastewater to Sacramento River, a water of the United States, and to on-site evaporation/percolation final disposal ponds immediately south of the constructed treatment system. Historically, the Facility has been permitted to discharge to the

M&T Irrigation Canal (located adjacent to and immediately west of the Facility) in previous Orders. Discharges to the M&T Irrigation Canal have not been permitted during the term of this Order as discussed in section VI.B.1.k of this Fact Sheet. Discharges to the M&T Irrigation Canal may be reinstated during the term of this Order in accordance with Reopener Provisions section VI.C.1.k. The Discharger has not indicated or demonstrated the necessity to maintain this discharge location as no discharges to the M&T Irrigation Canal have occurred in the past 30 years.

The Discharger was previously regulated by Order R5-2010-0019 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0079081 adopted on 29 January 2010 and expired on 1 January 2015. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.

Prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that results in a decrease of flow in any portion of a watercourse, the Discharger must file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for such a change. The State Water Board retains the jurisdictional authority to enforce such requirements under Water Code section 1211.

- C. The Discharger filed a report of waste discharge (ROWD) and submitted an application for reissuance of its WDR's and NPDES permit on 18 March 2014. Supplemental information was requested on 17 April 2014 and received on 23 June 2014. The application was deemed complete on 23 July 2014. A site visit was conducted on 14 October 2015 to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and requirements for waste discharge.

## II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Discharger provides sewerage service for the community of Chico and serves a population of approximately 86,000. The design daily average flow capacity of the Facility is 12 million gallons per day (MGD) based on the design daily average dry weather flow.

### A. Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls

The treatment system at the Facility consists of preliminary influent bar screening; grit removal, primary sedimentation; biological treatment by activated sludge, including nitrification; secondary sedimentation; disinfection; and dechlorination. Sludge is anaerobically digested, mechanically dewatered using a centrifuge, and temporarily stored on-site in sludge drying beds during the wet weather season. Temporarily stored sludge is solar dried further during the subsequent dry weather season and hauled off annually to a landfill before the subsequent wet weather season.

### B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

1. The Facility is located in Section 2, T21N, R1E, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B, a part of this Order.
2. Treated municipal wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point No. D-001 to the Sacramento River, a water of the United States at a point latitude 39° 41' 28.55" N and longitude 121° 56' 26.76" W.
3. Treated municipal wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point No. D-002 to evaporation/percolation final disposal ponds at a point latitude 39° 41' 42.85"N and longitude 121° 54' 43.12"W. Discharge Point No.D-002 discharges to the M&T Pond. The M&T Pond is hydraulically connected to the Southeast Pond and Southwest Pond. The disposal ponds are located immediately south of, and adjacent to, the constructed treatment system at the Facility.

**C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data**

Effluent limitations/Discharge Specifications contained in Order R5-2010-0019 for discharges from Discharge Point 003 (Monitoring Location EFF- 001) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order R5-2010-0019 are as follows:

**Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data From July 2012 to July 2015		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	30	45	90	6.1	11.5	11.5
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	30	45	90	10.9	19	19
Total Residual Chlorine	mg/L		0.01 (4-day average)	0.02 (1-hour average)	0.32 (4-day average)	--	4.99 (1-hour average)
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/ 100 mL	23 (median)		500	18 (median)	900	900
pH	standard units			6.0 (IMIN), 9.0 (IMAX)	6.65, 7.28	6.51, 7.32	6.38, 7.51
Ammonia	mg/L	21.29		42.71	11.55 <sup>1</sup> / 1.96 <sup>2</sup>	11.55 <sup>1</sup> / 1.96 <sup>2</sup>	11.55 <sup>1</sup> / 1.96 <sup>2</sup>
Average Dry Weather Flow (July-Sept)	mgd	12.0			6.015 (July-Sept)	--	6.83 (July-Sept)
<b>Discharge D-001 and D-003 *Discharges to the Sacramento River</b>							
Total Recoverable Copper	µg/L	81.00		160.00	8.9	8.9	8.9
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	29.45		48.46	2.2	2.2	2.2
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	41.04		78.28	20	20	20
<b>Discharge D-002 (April 15 through December 15) *Discharges to the M&amp;T Irrigation Canal</b>							
Total Recoverable Copper	µg/L	13.00		26.00	No Discharges to D-002		
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	1.68		2.77			
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	1.83		3.50			
<b>Discharge D-002 (December 16 through April 14) *Discharges to the M&amp;T Irrigation Canal</b>							
Total Recoverable Copper	µg/L	3.30		6.70	No Discharges to D-002		
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.41		0.68			
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56		1.07			

<sup>1</sup> MEC observed not representative of nitrification capabilities at the Facility as described in section IV.C.3.c.

<sup>2</sup> MEC observed is representative of nitrification capabilities at the Facility as described in section IV.C.3.c.

**A. Compliance Summary**

1. Central Valley Water Board issued Administrative Civil Liability (ACL) Order No. R5-2010-0505 on 1 January 2010 which assessed a civil liability of \$153,000 against the Discharger for not properly chlorinating and/or dechlorinating effluent prior to discharging to the Sacramento River as required by Orders R5-2004-0073. The Discharger settled

this ACL action by paying an administrative civil liability of \$78,000 and completing a supplemental environmental project (SEP) totaling at least \$75,000 in associated expenditures.

2. Central Valley Water Board issued a Notice of Violation (NOV) and Offer to Participate in Expedited Payment Program No. R5-2010-0532 on 1 September 2010 which proposed to assess a civil liability of \$3,000 against the Discharger for violations of effluent limitations for total residual chlorine specified in Orders R5-2010-0019. The Discharger settled this ACL by paying an administrative civil liability of \$3,000.
3. Central Valley Water Board issued ACL Complaint No. R5-2014-0574 on 7 November 2014 which proposed to assess a civil liability of \$21,000 against the Discharger for violations of effluent limitations for total residual chlorine specified in Orders R5-2010-0019. The Discharger settled this ACL action by paying an administrative civil liability of \$21,000.

#### **B. Planned Changes**

1. As described in this Fact Sheet, the Discharger shall construct improvements necessary to ensure compliance with Land Discharge Specifications section IV.B of this Order.

### **III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

The requirements contained in this Order are based on the requirements and authorities described in this section.

#### **A. Legal Authorities**

This Order serves as WDR's pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. EPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as an NPDES permit for point source discharges from this Facility to surface waters.

#### **B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of CEQA, (commencing with section 21100) of Division 13 of the Public Resources Code.

#### **C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans**

1. **Water Quality Control Plan.** Requirements of this Order specifically implement the applicable Water Quality Control Plans.
  - a. **Basin Plan.** The Central Valley Water Board adopted a Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River Basin and San Joaquin River Basin, Fourth Edition, revised June 2015 (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. Requirements in this Order implement the Basin Plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply. Beneficial uses applicable to the Sacramento River are as follows:

**Table F-3. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses**

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
D-001	Sacramento River	<u>Existing:</u> Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); agricultural supply, including irrigation and stock watering (AGR); industrial service supply (IND); hydropower generation (POW); water contact recreation, including canoeing and rafting (REC-1); non-contact water recreation (REC-2); warm freshwater habitat (WARM); cold freshwater habitat (COLD); migration of aquatic organisms, warm and cold (MIGR); spawning, reproduction, and/or early development, warm and cold (SPWN); wildlife habitat (WILD), and navigation (NAV).
D-002	Underlying Groundwater	<u>Existing:</u> Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); agricultural supply, including irrigation and stock watering (AGR); industrial service supply (IND); and industrial process supply (PRO).

2. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** U.S. EPA adopted the NTR on 22 December 1992, and later amended it on 4 May 1995 and 9 November 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On 18 May 2000, U.S. EPA adopted the CTR. The CTR promulgated new toxics criteria for California and, in addition, incorporated the previously adopted NTR criteria that were applicable in the state. The CTR was amended on 13 February 2001. These rules contain federal water quality criteria for priority pollutants.
3. **State Implementation Policy.** On 2 March 2000, the State Water Board adopted the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on 28 April 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the U.S. EPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Central Valley Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on 18 May 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the U.S. EPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on 24 February 2005, that became effective on 13 July 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.
4. **Antidegradation Policy.** Federal regulation 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 requires that the state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution 68-16, the Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California (State Anti-Degradation Policy). The State Anti-Degradation Policy is deemed to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. The State Anti-Degradation Policy requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Central Valley Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the State and federal antidegradation policies. The permitted discharge must be consistent with the antidegradation provision of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Anti-Degradation Policy. The Board finds this order is consistent with the Federal and State Water Board antidegradation regulations and policy. This order also requires new groundwater monitoring wells be installed and sampled during the term of the order. As a result of this new data, the Discharger is further required to submit an

Antidegradation Reevaluation that must be submitted with its ROWD that is to be provided to the Board as required by Special Provision VI.C.2.c.

5. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l) restrict backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require that effluent limitations in a reissued permit must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed.
6. **Domestic Water Quality.** In compliance with Water Code section 106.3, it is the policy of the State of California that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. This Order promotes that policy by requiring discharges to meet maximum contaminant levels designed to protect human health and ensure that water is safe for domestic use.
7. **Endangered Species Act Requirements.** This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code, §§ 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with effluent limits, receiving water limits, and other requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state. The Discharger is responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.
8. **Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act.** Section 13263.6(a) of the Water Code requires that *“the regional board shall prescribe effluent limitations as part of the waste discharge requirements of a POTW for all substances that the most recent toxic chemical release data reported to the state emergency response commission pursuant to Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 11023) (EPCRA) indicate as discharged into the POTW, for which the state board or the regional board has established numeric water quality objectives, and has determined that the discharge is or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to, an excursion above any numeric water quality objective.”*

The most recent toxic chemical data report does not indicate any reportable off-site releases or discharges to the collection system for this Facility. Therefore, a reasonable potential analysis based on information reported under EPCRA cannot be conducted. There is no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above any numeric water quality objectives included within the Basin Plan or in any State Water Board plan, so no effluent limitations are included in this permit pursuant to Water Code section 13263.6(a).

However, as detailed elsewhere in this Order, available effluent data indicate that there are constituents present in the effluent that have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality standards and require inclusion of effluent limitations based on federal and state laws and regulations.

9. **Storm Water Requirements.** USEPA promulgated federal regulations for storm water on 16 November 1990 in 40 C.F.R. parts 122, 123, and 124. The NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program regulates storm water discharges from wastewater treatment facilities. Wastewater treatment plants are applicable industries under the storm water program and are obligated to comply with the federal regulations. The Discharger has indicated that all storm water is redirected to the headworks, therefore the NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program is not applicable to this facility.

#### D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List

1. Under section 303(d) of the CWA, states, territories and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of water quality limited segments. The waters on these lists do not meet water quality standards, even after point sources of pollution have installed the minimum required levels of pollution control technology. On 30 July 2015 USEPA gave final approval to California's 2014 section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments. The Basin Plan references this list of Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs), which are defined as "...those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate limitations for point sources (40 C.F.R. part 130, et seq.)." The Basin Plan also states, "Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to [WQLSs]. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment." The listing for the Sacramento River includes: DDT, dieldrin, mercury, PCBs, and unknown toxicity.
2. **Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL's).** USEPA requires the Central Valley Water Board to develop TMDL's for each 303(d) listed pollutant and water body combination. At the time of this permit renewal, there are no approved TMDL's with wasteload allocations that apply to this facility. Table F-4, below, identifies the 303(d) listings and the status of each TMDL.

**Table F-4. 303 (d) List for the Sacramento River**

<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Potential Sources</b>	<b>TMDL Completion<sup>1</sup></b>
DDT	Source Unknown	2021
dieldrin	Source Unknown	2021
mercury	Source Unknown	2021
PCBs	Source Unknown	2021
Unknown toxicity	Source Unknown	2019

3. The 303(d) listings and TMDL's have been considered in the development of the Order. A pollutant-by-pollutant evaluation of each pollutant of concern is described in section VI.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

#### E. Other Plans, Polices and Regulations

1. **Title 27.** Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations (hereafter Title 27) contains regulatory requirements for the treatment, storage, processing, and disposal of solid waste. The "wastewater exemption" in 27 CCR section 20090(b), exempts discharges of wastewater to land, including but not limited to evaporation ponds or percolation ponds, from the requirements of Title 27 when certain preconditions are met:

*(1) the applicable [regional water quality control board] has issued WDRs, or waived such issuance;*

*(2) the discharge is in compliance with the applicable water quality control plan; and*

*(3) the wastewater does not need to be managed . . . as a hazardous waste . . .*

The Facility's evaporation/percolation disposal ponds are exempt from Title 27 because the Central Valley Water Board has issued WDRs, the discharge is in compliance with the Basin Plan and will remain in compliance with the Basin Plan through compliance with the WDRs, and the wastewater discharge is not a hazardous waste.

#### IV. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

Effluent limitations and toxic and pretreatment effluent standards established pursuant to sections 301 (Effluent Limitations), 302 (Water Quality Related Effluent Limitations), 304 (Information and Guidelines), and 307 (Toxic and Pretreatment Effluent Standards) of the CWA and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharge.

The CWA mandates the implementation of effluent limitations that are as stringent as necessary to meet water quality standards established pursuant to state or federal law [33 U.S.C., §1311(b)(1)(C); 40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)]. NPDES permits must incorporate discharge limits necessary to ensure that water quality standards are met. This requirement applies to narrative criteria as well as to criteria specifying maximum amounts of particular pollutants. Pursuant to federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i), NPDES permits must contain limits that control all pollutants that "are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality standard, including state narrative criteria for water quality." Federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(vi), further provide that "[w]here a State has not established a water quality criterion for a specific chemical pollutant that is present in an effluent at a concentration that causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above a narrative criterion within an applicable State water quality standard, the permitting authority must establish effluent limits."

The CWA requires point source dischargers to control the amount of conventional, non-conventional, and toxic pollutants that are discharged into the waters of the United States. The control of pollutants discharged is established through effluent limitations and other requirements in NPDES permits. There are two principal bases for effluent limitations in the Code of Federal Regulations: 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards; and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBEL's) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water where numeric water quality objectives have not been established. The Basin Plan at page IV-17.00 for discharges in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins contains an implementation policy, "Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives," that specifies that the Central Valley Water Board "*will, on a case-by-case basis, adopt numerical limitations in orders which will implement the narrative objectives.*" This Policy complies with 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1). With respect to narrative objectives, the Central Valley Water Board must establish effluent limitations using one or more of three specified sources, including: (1) USEPA's published water quality criteria, (2) a proposed state criterion (i.e., water quality objective) or an explicit state policy interpreting its narrative water quality criteria (i.e., the Central Valley Water Board's "Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives") (40 C.F.R. § 122.44(d)(1)(vi)(A), (B) or (C)), or (3) an indicator parameter.

The Basin Plan includes numeric site-specific water quality objectives and narrative objectives for toxicity, chemical constituents, discoloration, radionuclides, and tastes and odors. The narrative toxicity objective states: "*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*" (Basin Plan at III-8.00) The Basin Plan states that material and relevant information, including numeric criteria, and recommendations from other agencies and scientific literature will be utilized in evaluating compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. The narrative chemical constituents objective states that waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that

adversely affect beneficial uses. At minimum, "...water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)" in Title 22 of CCR. The Basin Plan further states that, to protect all beneficial uses, the Central Valley Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs. The narrative tastes and odors objective states: "Water shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to domestic or municipal water supplies or to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses."

#### **A. Discharge Prohibitions**

- 1. Prohibition III.A (No discharge or application of waste other than that described in this Order).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13260 that requires filing of a ROWD before discharges can occur. The Discharger submitted a ROWD for the discharges described in this Order; therefore, discharges not described in this Order are prohibited.
- 2. Prohibition III.B (No bypasses or overflow of untreated wastewater, except under the conditions at C.F.R. section 122.41(m)(4)).** As stated in section I.G of Attachment D, Standard Provisions, this Order prohibits bypass from any portion of the treatment facility. Federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m), define "bypass" as the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. This section of the federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m)(4), prohibits bypass unless it is unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage. In considering the Regional Water Board's prohibition of bypasses, the State Water Board adopted a precedential decision, Order No. WQO 2002-0015, which cites the federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. section 122.41(m), as allowing bypass only for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation.
- 3. Prohibition III.C (No controllable condition shall create a nuisance).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13050 that requires water quality objectives established for the prevention of nuisance within a specific area. The Basin Plan prohibits conditions that create a nuisance.
- 4. Prohibition III.D (No inclusion of pollutant free wastewater shall cause improper operation of the Facility's systems).** This prohibition is based on 40 C.F.R. section 122.41 et seq. that requires the proper design and operation of treatment facilities
- 5. Prohibition III.E (No discharge or applicate of waste classified as 'hazardous').** This prohibition is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the surface water and groundwater beneficial uses.

#### **B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations**

##### **1. Scope and Authority**

Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing U.S. EPA permit regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44 require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The discharge authorized by this Order must meet minimum federal technology-based requirements based on Secondary Treatment Standards at 40 C.F.R. part 133.

Regulations promulgated in 40 C.F.R. section 125.3(a)(1) require technology-based effluent limitations for municipal Dischargers to be placed in NPDES permits based on Secondary Treatment Standards or Equivalent to Secondary Treatment Standards.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-500) established the minimum performance requirements for POTW's [defined in section 304(d)(1)]. Section 301(b)(1)(B) of that Act requires that such treatment works must, as a minimum, meet effluent limitations based on secondary treatment as defined by the U.S. EPA Administrator.

Based on this statutory requirement, U.S. EPA developed secondary treatment regulations, which are specified in 40 C.F.R. part 133. These technology-based regulations apply to all municipal wastewater treatment plants and identify the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment in terms of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>), total suspended solids (TSS), and pH.

**2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations**

- a. **BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS.** Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. part 133, establish the minimum weekly and monthly average level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS. A daily maximum effluent limitation for BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS is also included in the Order to ensure that the treatment works are not organically overloaded and operate in accordance with design capabilities. In addition, 40 C.F.R. section 133.102, in describing the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment, states that the 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85 percent. This Order contains a limitation requiring an average of 85 percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS over each calendar month.
- b. **Flow.** The Facility was designed to provide a secondary level of treatment for up to a design flow of 12 mgd (ADWF). Therefore, this Order contains an average dry weather discharge flow effluent limit of 12 mgd.
- c. **pH.** The secondary treatment regulations at 40 C.F.R. part 133 also require that pH be maintained between 6.0 and 9.0 standard units. This Order, however, requires more stringent WQBEL's for pH to comply with the Basin Plan's water quality objectives for pH.

**Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations  
Discharge Point D-001**

**Table F-5. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C) <sup>3</sup>	mg/L	30	45	90	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>2</sup>	3002	4504	9007	--	--
Total Suspended Solids <sup>3</sup>	mg/L	30	45	90	--	--
	lbs/day <sup>2</sup>	3002	4504	9007	--	--
pH <sup>1</sup>	Standard units	--	--	--	6.0	9.0
Flow	mgd	12	--	--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> Note that more stringent WQBEL's for pH are applicable and are established as final effluent limitations in this Order (see section IV.C.3.c of this Fact Sheet).

<sup>2</sup> Based on an average dry weather flow of 12 MGD.

**C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL's)**

**1. Scope and Authority**

CWA Section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards.

Section 122.44(d)(1)(i) of 40 C.F.R. requires that permits include effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at levels that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard. Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective for the pollutant, WQBEL's must be established using: (1) U.S. EPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), supplemented where necessary by other relevant information; (2) an indicator parameter for the pollutant of concern; or (3) a calculated numeric water quality criterion, such as a proposed state criterion or policy interpreting the state's narrative criterion, supplemented with other relevant information, as provided in section 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBEL's when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses of the receiving water as specified in the Basin Plan, and achieve applicable water quality objectives and criteria that are contained in other state plans and policies, or any applicable water quality criteria contained in the CTR and NTR.

## 2. **Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives**

The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply.

The Basin Plan on page II-1.00 states: "*Protection and enhancement of existing and potential beneficial uses are primary goals of water quality planning...*" and with respect to disposal of wastewaters states that "*...disposal of wastewaters is [not] a prohibited use of waters of the State; it is merely a use which cannot be satisfied to the detriment of beneficial uses.*"

CWA section 101(a)(2) states: "*it is the national goal that wherever attainable, an interim goal of water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and for recreation in and on the water be achieved by July 1, 1983.*" Federal Regulations, developed to implement the requirements of the CWA, create a rebuttable presumption that all waters be designated as fishable and swimmable. Federal Regulations, 40 CFR sections 131.2 and 131.10, require that all waters of the State be regulated to protect the beneficial uses of public water supply, protection and propagation of fish, shell fish and wildlife, recreation in and on the water, agricultural, industrial and other purposes including navigation. 40 C.F.R. section 131.3(e) defines existing beneficial uses as those uses actually attained after 28 November 1975, whether or not they are included in the water quality standards. Federal Regulation, 40 C.F.R. section 131.10 requires that uses be obtained by implementing effluent limitations, requires that all downstream uses be protected and states that in no case shall a State adopt waste transport or waste assimilation as a beneficial use for any waters of the United States.

- a. **Receiving Water and Beneficial Uses.** Refer to III.C.1. above for a complete description of the receiving water and beneficial uses.
- b. **Effluent and Ambient Background Data.** The reasonable potential analysis (RPA), as described in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, was based on data from July 2012 through July 2015, which includes effluent and ambient background data

submitted in Self Monitoring Reports (SMRs) and the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD).

- c. **Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone.** In the ROWD, the Discharger requested a dilution credits of up to 42:1 for human health constituents based on the Sacramento River harmonic mean flow of 7500 cfs and an annual average discharge flow of 12 mgd. The constituents with effluent limitations in this Order that are based on human health criteria include chlorodibromomethane, dichlorobromomethane, and nitrate plus nitrite.

The CWA directs the states to adopt water quality standards to protect the quality of its waters. USEPA's current water quality standards regulation authorizes states to adopt general policies, such as mixing zones, to implement state water quality standards (40 CFR § 122.44 and 122.45). The USEPA allows states to have broad flexibility in designing its mixing zone policies. Primary policy and guidance on determining mixing zone and dilution credits is provided by the SIP and the Basin Plan. If no procedure applies in the SIP or the Basin Plan, then the Central Valley Water Board may use the USEPA *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control* (EPA/505/2-90-001) (TSD).

For non-Priority Pollutant constituents, the allowance of mixing zones by the Central Valley Water Board is discussed in the Basin Plan, *Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*, which states in part, "*In conjunction with the issuance of NPDES and storm water permits, the Regional Board may designate mixing zones within which water quality objectives will not apply provided the discharger has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Regional Board that the mixing zone will not adversely impact beneficial uses. If allowed, different mixing zones may be designated for different types of objectives, including, but not limited to, acute aquatic life objectives, chronic aquatic life objectives, human health objectives, and acute and chronic whole effluent toxicity objectives, depending in part on the averaging period over which the objectives apply. In determining the size of such mixing zones, the Regional Board will consider the applicable procedures and guidelines in the EPA's Water Quality Standards Handbook and the [TSD]. Pursuant to EPA guidelines, mixing zones designated for acute aquatic life objectives will generally be limited to a small zone of initial dilution in the immediate vicinity of the discharge.*"

For Priority Pollutants, the SIP supersedes the Basin Plan mixing zone provisions. Section 1.4.2 of the SIP states, in part, "*...with the exception of effluent limitations derived from TMDLs, in establishing and determining compliance with effluent limitations for applicable human health, acute aquatic life, or chronic aquatic life priority pollutant criteria/objectives or the toxicity objective for aquatic life protection in a . . . basin plan, the [Regional Board] may grant mixing zones and dilution credits to dischargers...The applicable priority pollutant criteria and objectives are to be met through a water body except within any mixing zone granted by [the Regional Board]. **The allowance of mixing zones is discretionary and shall be determined on a discharge-by-discharge basis.** [The Regional Board] may consider allowing mixing zones and dilution credits only for discharges with a physically identifiable point of discharge that is regulated through an NPDES permit issued by [the Regional Board]."* [emphasis added]

For incompletely-mixed discharges, the Discharger must complete an independent mixing zone study to demonstrate to the Central Valley Water Board that a dilution credit is appropriate. In granting a mixing zone, Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP requires the following to be met:

**“A mixing zone shall be as small as practicable.** *The following conditions must be met in allowing a mixing zone:* [emphasis added]

A: A mixing zone shall not:

1. *compromise the integrity of the entire water body;*
2. *cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone;*
3. *restrict the passage of aquatic life;*
4. *adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under federal or State endangered species laws;*
5. *produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life;*
6. *result in floating debris, oil, or scum;*
7. *produce objectionable color, odor, taste, or turbidity;*
8. *cause objectionable bottom deposits;*
9. *cause nuisance;*
10. *dominate the receiving water body or overlap a mixing zone from different outfalls; or*
11. *be allowed at or near any drinking water intake. A mixing zone is not a source of drinking water. To the extent of any conflict between this determination and the Sources of Drinking Water Policy ([State Water Board] Resolution No. 88-63), this [SIP] supersedes the provisions of that policy.”*

Section 1.4.2.1 of the SIP establishes the authority for the Central Valley Water Board to consider dilution credits based on the mixing zone conditions in a receiving water. Section 1.4.2.1 in part states:

*“The dilution credit, D, is a numerical value associated with the mixing zone that accounts for the receiving water entrained into the discharge. The dilution credit is a value used in the calculation of effluent limitations (described in Section 1.4).*

***Dilution credits may be limited or denied on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis, which may result in a dilution credit for all, some, or no priority pollutants in the discharge.*** [emphasis added]

The Discharger completed construction of a new 32-port outfall diffuser (identified as Discharge Point 003) downstream of the existing outfall diffuser during the term of Order R5-2010-0019. The existing outfall diffuser (identified as Discharge Point 001) was decommissioned and is no longer in service. Order R5-2010-0019 granted a 94-foot wide and 250-foot long mixing zone and dilution credits for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, and dichlorobromomethane based on previously submitted mixing zone modeling studies conducted by the Discharger and consistent with applicable findings established in previous Orders. Dilutions credits were granted based on study results indicating available dilution factors of 47, 47, and 88 for acute aquatic life, chronic aquatic life, and human health constituents, respectively.

Order R5-2010-0019 required the Discharger to conduct a new mixing zone and dilution study to determine the actual mixing zone and dilution that is achievable in the receiving water from the new multiport diffuser (identified as Discharge Point 001 in this Order). The Discharger submitted a new mixing zone and dilution study to the Central Valley Water Board on 25 January 2012. Study results indicate that significantly less dilution is available for the existing mixing zones. At 250 feet

downstream of the new outfall diffuser, the results present dilution factors of 15.8, 19.9, and 46.5 for acute aquatic life, chronic aquatic life, and human health constituents, respectively.

Study results indicate that the maximum plume width generated by the new multiport port diffuser is 125 feet wide at 250 feet downstream. The plume width is less than 25% of the actual width of the river indicating adequate zone of passage for aquatic life.

Dilution credits allowed for in this Order are in accordance with Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP. The allowance of a mixing zone and dilution credits are a discretionary act by the Central Valley Water Board. The Central Valley Water Board has determined that the maximum dilution credit on a constituent-by-constituent basis needed for this discharge and are shown in the following table (also discussed further in section IV.C.3).

**Table F-6. Dilution Credits Associated with Performance-based Effluent Limitations**

Pollutant	Units	ECA <sup>1</sup>	Criterion	Background	Dilution Credit <sup>2</sup>
Ammonia <sup>3</sup>	mg/L	27	2.14	0.1	12.2
Ammonia <sup>4</sup>	mg/L	7.6	1.4	0.1	4.7
Chlorodibromomethane <sup>5</sup>	µg/L	17.2	0.41	0.04	46.5
Copper <sup>6</sup>	µg/L	20	8.9	4.7	2.7
Copper <sup>7</sup>	µg/L	16	6.2	4.7	6.6
Dichlorobromomethane <sup>8</sup>	µg/L	25.2	0.56	0.031	46.5
Nitrate plus Nitrite (as N) <sup>9</sup>	mg/L	60	10	0.09	5

<sup>1</sup> Equivalent to the performance-based AMEL or annual average effluent limitation.

<sup>2</sup> The dilution credit is calculated using the steady-state mass balance equation rearranged to solve for the dilution credit, as follows:

$$D = (ECA - C) / (C - B)$$

<sup>3</sup> Based on a 40 foot mixing zone and dilution credits granted for the acute aquatic life criteria for ammonia.

<sup>4</sup> Based on a <10 foot mixing zone and dilution credits granted for the chronic aquatic life criteria for ammonia.

<sup>5</sup> Based on a 250 foot mixing zone and dilution credits granted for the human health criteria for chlorodibromomethane.

<sup>6</sup> Based on a <10 foot mixing zone and dilution credits granted for the acute aquatic life criteria for copper.

<sup>7</sup> Based on a <10 foot mixing zone and dilution credits granted for the chronic aquatic life criteria for copper.

<sup>8</sup> Based on a 250 foot mixing zone and dilution credits granted for the human health criteria for dichlorobromomethane.

<sup>9</sup> Based on a <10 foot mixing zone and dilution credits granted for the human health criteria for nitrate plus nitrate (as N).

To fully comply with all applicable laws, regulations and policies of the State, Central Valley Water Board approved a mixing zone and the associated dilution credits shown in Table F-6 based on the following:

- i. Mixing zones are allowed under the SIP provided all elements contained in Section 1.4.2.2 are met. Based on the mixing zone study conducted by the Discharger the Central Valley Water Board has determined that these factors are met.
- ii. Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP requires mixing zones to be as small as practicable. Based on the mixing zone study conducted by the Discharger the Central Valley Water Board has determined the mixing zone is as small as practicable.
- iii. In accordance with Section 1.4.2.2 of the SIP, the Board has determined the mixing zone is as small as practicable, will not compromise the integrity of the

entire water body, restrict the passage of aquatic life, dominate the water body or overlap existing mixing zones from different outfalls. The mixing zone is small relative to the large size of the receiving water, is not at or near a drinking water intake, and does not overlap a mixing zone from a different outfall.

- iv. The Central Valley Water Board is allowing a mixing zone for aquatic life and human health constituents and has determined allowing such mixing zone will not cause acutely toxic conditions to aquatic life passing through the mixing zone.
- v. The Central Valley Water Board has determined the discharge will not adversely impact biologically sensitive or critical habitats, including, but not limited to, habitat of species listed under the federal or State endangered species laws, because the mixing zone is for human health criteria only, is relatively small, and acutely toxic conditions will not occur in the mixing zone. The discharge will not produce undesirable or nuisance aquatic life, result in floating debris, oil, or scum, produce objectionable odor, taste, or turbidity, cause objectionable bottom deposits, or cause nuisance, because the proposed Order establishes end-of-pipe effluent limitations (e.g., for BOD5 and TSS) and discharge prohibitions to prevent these conditions from occurring.
- vi. As required by the SIP, in determining the extent of or whether to allow a mixing zone and dilution credit, the Central Valley Water Board has considered the presence of pollutants in the discharge that are carcinogenic, mutagenic, teratogenic, persistent, bioaccumulative, or attractive to aquatic organisms, and concluded that the allowance of the mixing zone and dilution credit is adequately protective of the beneficial uses of the receiving water.
- vii. The Central Valley Water Board has determined mixing zone complies with the SIP for priority pollutants.
- viii. The mixing zone study indicates the maximum allowed dilution factors to be 15.8, 19.9, and 46.5 for acute aquatic life, chronic aquatic life, and human health constituents. Section 1.4.2.2B of the SIP, in part states, "The [Regional Water Board] shall deny or significantly limit a mixing zone and dilution credits as necessary to protect beneficial uses, meet the conditions of this Policy, or comply with other regulatory requirements." The Central Valley Water Board has determined that dilution factors of 15.8, 19.9, and 46.5 are not needed or necessary for the Discharger to achieve compliance with this Order.
- ix. The Central Valley Water Board has determined the mixing zone complies with the Basin Plan for non-priority pollutants. The Basin Plan requires a mixing zone not adversely impact beneficial uses. Beneficial uses will not be adversely affected for the same reasons discussed above. In determining the size of the mixing zone, the Central Valley Water Board has considered the procedures and guidelines in Section 5.1 of USEPA's Water Quality Standards Handbook, 2nd Edition (updated July 2007) and Section 2.2.2 of the TSD. The SIP incorporates the same guidelines.
- x. The Central Valley Water Board has determined that allowing dilution factors that exceed those proposed by this Order would not comply with the State Antidegradation Policy for receiving waters outside the allowable mixing zones for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and nitrate plus nitrite. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Resolution No. 68-16 incorporates the federal antidegradation policy and requires that existing

quality of waters be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. Item 2 of Resolution No. 68-16 states:

*“Any activity which produces or may produce a waste or increased volume or concentration of waste and which dischargers or proposed to discharge to existing high quality waters will be required to meet waste discharge requirements which will result in the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that (a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur and (b) the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.”*

The effluent limitations established in the Order for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and nitrate plus nitrite that have been adjusted for dilution credits provided in Table F-6 were developed based on performance of the Discharger’s current wastewater treatment capabilities. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board determined the effluent limitations required by this Order will result in the Discharger implementing best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that pollution or nuisance will not occur and the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained. The Central Valley Water Board also determined the Discharger will be in immediate compliance with the effluent limitations.

The Central Valley Water Board also determined establishing effluent limitations for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and nitrate plus nitrite that have been adjusted for dilution credits provided in Table F-6 are consistent with Section 1.4.2.2B of the SIP that requires the Central Valley Water Board to deny or significantly limit a mixing zone and dilution credits as necessary to comply with other regulatory requirements.

xi. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board has determined the effluent limitations established in the Order for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and nitrate plus nitrite that have been adjusted for dilution credits provided in Table F-6 are appropriate and necessary to comply with the Basin Plan, SIP, Federal anti-degradation regulations and Resolution No. 68-16.

d. **Conversion Factors.** The CTR contains aquatic life criteria for arsenic, cadmium, chromium III, chromium VI, copper, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc which are presented in dissolved concentrations. USEPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. The default USEPA conversion factors contained in Appendix 3 of the SIP were used to convert the applicable dissolved criteria to total recoverable criteria.

e. **Hardness-Dependent CTR Metals Criteria.** The CTR and the NTR contain water quality criteria for seven metals that vary as a function of hardness. The lower the hardness, the lower the water quality criteria. The metals with hardness-dependent criteria include cadmium, copper, chromium III, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc.

This Order has established the criteria for hardness-dependent metals based on the hardness of the receiving water (actual ambient hardness) as required by the SIP<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The SIP does not address how to determine the hardness for application to the equations for the protection of aquatic life when using hardness-dependent metals criteria. It simply states, in Section 1.2, that the criteria shall be properly adjusted for hardness using the hardness of the receiving water.

and the CTR<sup>1</sup>. The SIP and the CTR require the use of “receiving water” or “actual ambient” hardness, respectively, to determine effluent limitations for these metals. The CTR requires that the hardness values used shall be consistent with the design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones<sup>2</sup>. Where design flows for aquatic life criteria include the lowest one-day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years (1Q10) and the lowest average seven consecutive day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years (7Q10).<sup>3</sup> This section of the CTR also indicates that the design conditions should be established such that the appropriate criteria are not exceeded more than once in a three year period on average.<sup>4</sup> The CTR requires that when mixing zones are allowed the CTR criteria apply at the edge of the mixing zone, otherwise the criteria apply throughout the water body including at the point of discharge.<sup>5</sup> The CTR does not define the term “ambient,” as applied in the regulations. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board has considerable discretion to consider upstream and downstream ambient conditions when establishing the appropriate water quality criteria that fully complies with the CTR and SIP.

### ***Summary findings***

The ambient hardness for the Sacramento River is represented by the data in Figure F-1, below, which shows ambient hardness ranging from 45 mg/L to 71 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) based on collected ambient data from March 2013 through July 2015. Given the high variability in ambient hardness values, there is no single hardness value that describes the ambient receiving water for all possible scenarios (e.g., minimum, maximum). Because of this variability, staff has determined that based on the ambient hardness concentrations measured in the receiving water, the Central Valley Water Board has discretion to select ambient hardness values within the range of 45 mg/L (minimum) up to 71 mg/L (maximum) (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>). Staff recommends that the Board use the ambient hardness values shown in Table F-7 for the following reasons.

- i. Using the ambient receiving water hardness values shown in Table F-7 will result in criteria and effluent limitations that ensure protection of beneficial uses under all ambient receiving water conditions.
- ii. The Water Code mandates that the Central Valley Water Board establish permit terms that will ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses. In this case, using the lowest measured ambient hardness to calculate effluent limitations is not required to protect beneficial uses. Calculating effluent limitations based on the lowest measured ambient hardness is not required by the CTR or SIP, and is not reasonable as it would result in overly conservative limits that will impart substantial costs to the Discharger and ratepayers without providing any additional protection of beneficial uses. In compliance with applicable state and federal regulatory requirements, after considering the entire range of ambient hardness values, Board staff has used the ambient hardness values shown in Table F-7 to calculate the proposed effluent limitations for hardness-dependent metals. The proposed effluent limitations are protective of beneficial uses under all flow conditions.

---

<sup>1</sup> The CTR requires that, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>), or less, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water must be used (40 C.F.R. § 131.38(c)(4)).

<sup>2</sup> 40 C.F.R. §131.3(c)(4)(ii)

<sup>3</sup> 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(iii) Table 4

<sup>4</sup> 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(iii) Table 4, notes 1 and 2

<sup>5</sup> 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(i)

- iii. Using an ambient hardness that is higher than the minimum of 45 mg/L will result in limits that may allow increased metals to be discharged to the river, but such discharge is allowed under the State Anti-Degradation Policy. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this degradation is consistent with the State Anti-Degradation Policy (see antidegradation findings in Section IV.D.4 of the Fact Sheet). The State Anti-Degradation Policy requires the Discharger to meet waste discharge requirements which will result in the best practicable treatment or control of the discharge necessary to assure that: a) a pollution or nuisance will not occur, and b) the highest water quality consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State will be maintained.
- iv. Using the ambient hardness values shown in Table F-7 is consistent with the CTR and SIP's requirements for developing metals criteria.

**Table F-7. Summary of CTR Criteria for Hardness-dependent Metals**

CTR Metals	Ambient Hardness (mg/L) <sup>2,3</sup>	CTR Criteria (µg/L, total recoverable) <sup>1</sup>	
		acute	chronic
Copper	62	8.9	6.2
Chromium III	62	1700	200
Cadmium	62	2.6	1.7
Lead	62	44.4	1.7
Nickel	62	313	34.8
Silver	62	1.8	--
Zinc	62	80	80

<sup>1</sup> Metal criteria rounded to two significant figures in accordance with the CTR (40 C.F.R. §131.38(b)(2)).

<sup>2</sup> The ambient hardness values in this table represent actual observed receiving water hardness measurements from the dataset shown in Figure F-1.

<sup>3</sup> The CTR's hardness dependent metals criteria equations vary differently depending on the metal, which results in differences in the range of ambient hardness values that may be used to develop effluent limitations that are protective of beneficial uses and comply with CTR criteria for all ambient flow conditions.

**Background**

The State Water Board provided direction regarding the selection of hardness in two precedential water quality orders: WQO 2008-0008 for the City of Davis Wastewater Treatment Plant (Davis Order) and WQO 2004-0013 for the Yuba City Wastewater Treatment Plant (Yuba City Order). The State Water Board recognized that the SIP and the CTR do not discuss the manner in which hardness is to be ascertained, thus regional water boards have considerable discretion in determining ambient hardness so long as the selected value is protective of water quality criteria under the given flow conditions. (Davis Order, p.10). The State Water Board explained that it is necessary that, "The [hardness] value selected should provide protection for all times of discharge under varying hardness conditions." (Yuba City Order, p. 8). The Davis Order also provides that, "Regardless of the hardness used, the resulting limits must always be protective of water quality criteria under all flow conditions." (Davis Order, p. 11)

The equation describing the total recoverable regulatory criterion, as established in the CTR, is as follows:

$$\text{CTR Criterion} = \text{WER} \times (e^{m[\ln(H)]+b}) \text{ (Equation 1)}$$

Where:

H = ambient hardness (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>)<sup>1</sup>

WER = water-effect ratio


m, b = metal- and criterion-specific constants

The direction in the CTR regarding hardness selection is that it must be based on ambient hardness and consistent with design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones. Consistent with design discharge conditions and design flows means that the selected “design” hardness must result in effluent limitations under design discharge conditions that do not result in more than one exceedance of the applicable criteria in a three year period.<sup>2</sup> Where design flows for aquatic life criteria include the lowest one-day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years (1Q10) and the lowest average seven consecutive day flow with an average reoccurrence frequency of once in ten years (7Q10). The 1Q10 and 7Q10 Sacramento River flows are 2800 cfs and 3300 cfs, respectively.

**Ambient conditions**

The ambient receiving water hardness varied from 45 mg/L to 71 mg/L, based on 31 samples from March 2013 through July 2015 (see Figure F-1).

**Figure F-1. Observed Ambient Hardness Concentrations**



In this analysis, the entire range of ambient hardness concentrations shown in Figure F-1 were considered to determine the appropriate ambient hardness to calculate the CTR criteria and effluent limitations that are protective under all discharge conditions.

**Approach to derivation of criteria**

As shown above, ambient hardness levels vary in the receiving water. Because of the variation, there is no single hardness value that describes the ambient receiving water for all possible scenarios (e.g., minimum, maximum, mid-point). While the hardness selected must be hardness of the ambient receiving water, selection of an ambient receiving water hardness that is too high would result in effluent limitations that do not protect beneficial uses. Also, the use of minimum ambient hardness would result in criteria that are protective of beneficial uses, but such criteria may not be representative considering the wide range of ambient conditions.

<sup>1</sup> For this discussion, all hardness values are expressed in mg/L as CaCO<sub>3</sub>.

<sup>2</sup> 40 C.F.R. §131.38(c)(2)(iii) Table 4, notes 1 and 2


*Reasonable worst-case ambient conditions.* To determine whether a selected ambient hardness value results in effluent limitations that are fully protective while complying with federal regulations and state policy, staff have conducted an analysis considering varying ambient hardness and flow conditions. To do this, the Central Valley Water Board has ensured that the receiving water hardness and criteria selected for effluent limitations are protective under “reasonable-worst case ambient conditions.” These conditions represent the receiving water conditions under which derived effluent limitations would ensure protection of beneficial uses under all ambient flow and hardness conditions.

Reasonable worst-case ambient conditions:

- “Low receiving water flow.” CTR design discharge conditions (1Q10 and 7Q10) have been selected to represent reasonable worst case receiving water flow conditions.
- “High receiving water flow (maximum receiving water flow).” This additional flow condition has been selected consistent with the Davis Order, which required that the hardness selected be protective of water quality criteria under all flow conditions.
- “Low receiving water hardness.” The minimum receiving water hardness condition of 45 mg/L was selected to represent the reasonable worst case receiving water hardness.
- “Background ambient metal concentration at criteria.” This condition assumes that the metal concentration in the background receiving water is equal to CTR criteria (upstream of the facility’s discharge). Based on data in the record, this is a design condition that has not occurred in the receiving water and is used in this analysis to ensure that limits are protective of beneficial uses even in the situation where there is no assimilative capacity.

*Iterative approach.* An iterative analysis has been used to select the ambient hardness to calculate the criteria that will result in effluent limitations that protect beneficial uses under all flow conditions.

The iterative approach is summarized in the following algorithm and described below in more detail.



1. **CRITERIA CALCULATION.** CTR criteria are calculated using the CTR equations based on actual measured ambient hardness sample results, starting with the maximum observed ambient hardness of 71 mg/L. Effluent metal concentrations necessary to meet the above calculated CTR criteria in the receiving water are calculated in accordance with the SIP.<sup>1</sup> This should not be confused with an effluent limit. Rather, it is the Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA), which is synonymous with the wasteload allocation defined by USEPA as “a definition of effluent water quality that is necessary to meet the water quality standards in the receiving water.”<sup>2</sup> If effluent limits are found to be needed, the limits are calculated to enforce the ECA considering effluent variability and the probability basis of the limit.
2. **CHECK.** USEPA’s simple mass balance equation<sup>3</sup> is used to evaluate if discharge at the computed ECA is protective. Resultant downstream metal concentrations are compared with downstream calculated CTR criteria under reasonable worst-case ambient conditions.
3. **ADAPT.** If step 2 results in:
  - (A) receiving water metal concentration that complies with CTR criteria under reasonable worst-case ambient conditions, then the hardness value is selected.
  - (B) receiving water metal concentration greater than CTR criteria, then return to bullet 1, selecting a lower ambient hardness value.

The CTR’s hardness dependent metals criteria equations contain metal-specific constants, so the criteria vary depending on the metal. Therefore, steps 1 through 3 must be repeated separately for each metal until ambient hardness values are

<sup>1</sup> SIP Section 1.4.B, Step 2, provides direction for calculating the Effluent Concentration Allowance.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. EPA, *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control (TSD)*, EPA/505/2-90-001 (March 1991), p. 96

<sup>3</sup> U.S. EPA, *NPDES Permit Writers’ Manual*, EPA 833-K-10-001 (September 2010), p. 6-24

determined that will result in criteria and effluent limitations that comply with the CTR and protect beneficial uses for all metals.

***Results of iterative analysis***

The above iterative analysis for each CTR hardness-dependent metal results in the selected ambient hardness values shown in Table F-7, above. Using these hardness values to calculate criteria, which are actual sample results collected in the receiving water, will result in effluent limitations that are protective under all ambient flow conditions. Copper and silver are used as examples below to illustrate the results of the analysis. Tables F-8 and F-9 below summarize the numeric results of the three step iterative approach for copper and silver. As shown in the example tables, ambient hardness values of 62 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) for copper and 62 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) for silver are used in the CTR equations to derive criteria and effluent limitations. Then under the “check” step, worst-case ambient receiving water conditions are used to test whether discharge results in compliance with CTR criteria and protection of beneficial uses.

The results of the above analysis, summarized in the tables below, show that the ambient hardness values selected using the three-step iterative process results in protective effluent limitations that achieve CTR criteria under all flow conditions. Tables F-8 and F-9 below, summarize the critical flow conditions. However, the analysis evaluated all flow conditions to ensure compliance with the CTR criteria at all times.

**Table F-8. Verification of CTR Compliance for Copper**

Receiving water hardness used to compute effluent limitations				62 mg/L
Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA) for Copper <sup>2</sup>				8.9 µg/L
	Downstream Ambient Concentrations Under Worst-Case Ambient Receiving Water Conditions			Complies with CTR Criteria?
	Hardness	CTR Criteria (µg/L)	Ambient Copper Concentration <sup>1</sup> (µg/L)	
1Q10	45.3	6.6	6.6	Yes
7Q10	45.3	6.6	6.6	Yes
Max receiving water flow	45.1	6.6	6.6	Yes

<sup>1</sup> This concentration is derived using worst-case ambient conditions. These conservative assumptions will ensure that the receiving water always complies with CTR criteria.

<sup>2</sup> The ECA defines effluent quality necessary to meet the CTR criteria in the receiving water. This Order includes average monthly and maximum daily effluent limits for copper of 15 µg/L and 20 µg/L, respectively. The effluent limits were calculated per section 1.4 of the SIP, which ensures compliance with the ECA considering effluent variability and the probability basis of each effluent limit.

**Table F-9. Verification of CTR Compliance for Silver**

Receiving water hardness used to compute effluent limitations				62 mg/L
Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA) for Silver <sup>2</sup>				1.8 µg/L
	Downstream Ambient Concentrations Under Worst-Case Ambient Receiving Water Conditions			Complies with CTR Criteria?
	Hardness	CTR Criteria (µg/L)	Ambient Silver Concentration <sup>1</sup> (µg/L)	
1Q10	45.3	1.0	1.0	Yes
7Q10	45.3	1.0	1.0	Yes
Max receiving water flow	45.1	1.0	1.0	Yes

<sup>1</sup> This concentration is derived using worst-case ambient conditions. These conservative assumptions will ensure that the receiving water always complies with CTR criteria.

<sup>2</sup> The ECA defines effluent quality necessary to meet the CTR criteria in the receiving water. There is no effluent limitation for silver as it demonstrates no reasonable potential.

**3. Determining the Need for WQBEL's**

- a. **Constituents with No Reasonable Potential.** WQBEL's are not included in this Order for constituents that do not demonstrate reasonable potential (i.e. constituents were not detected in the effluent or receiving water); however, monitoring for those pollutants is established in this Order as required by the SIP. If the results of effluent monitoring demonstrate reasonable potential, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.
- b. **Constituents with No Data or Insufficient Data.** Reasonable potential cannot be determined for the following constituents because effluent data are limited and ambient background concentrations are not available. The Discharger is required to continue to monitor for these constituents in the effluent using analytical methods that provide the best feasible detection limits. When additional data become

available, further analysis will be conducted to determine whether to add numeric effluent limitations or to continue monitoring.

i. **Cyanide**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes acute and chronic aquatic life criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for cyanide. These acute and chronic aquatic life criteria for cyanide are 22 µg/L (as a 1-hour average) and 5.2 µg/L (as a 4-day average), respectively.
- (b) **RPA Results.** Results in units of micrograms per liter (µg/L) from effluent and upstream receiving water monitoring conducted by the Discharger are presented in the table below.

Effluent Sample Date	Method Detection Level (MDL)	Reporting Level (RL)	Cyanide Effluent Result (µg/L)
2 October 2012	4	5	27
14 October 2013	0.000002	0.000003	0.0000085
15 September 2014	0.000002	0.000003	0.0000082

Receiving Water Sample Date	Method Detection Level (MDL)	Reporting Level (RL)	Cyanide Receiving Water Result (µg/L)
2 October 2012	4	5	32
14 October 2013	0.000002	0.000003	ND
15 September 2014	0.000002	0.000003	ND

The October 2012 reported concentrations were extremely high in both the effluent and upstream receiving water samples as compared to extremely low concentrations reported in 2013 and 2014. Staff reviewed available laboratory QA/QC information and was unable to determine specific testing deficiencies or explain the presence of cyanide in the upstream receiving water at an extremely high concentration exceeding the effluent. Nonetheless, it is not reasonable to consider these 2 October 2012 results to be accurate. It is exceedingly unlikely that cyanide would happen to be present in both sample locations on the same day, and at such high concentrations. It is much more likely that there was contamination from some other source during sampling or analysis. Therefore, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct accelerated monitoring for cyanide to confirm that it is not present at concentrations that has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria. The additional monitoring requirements for cyanide are described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E. This Order includes a reopener provision for modification, or revocation and reissuance, as a result of the detection of cyanide as described in Reopener Provisions section VI.C1.

ii. **Zinc**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes acute and chronic aquatic life criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for cyanide. These acute and chronic aquatic life criteria for cyanide are 80 µg/L (as a 1-hour average) and 80 µg/L (as a 4-day average), respectively based on ambient hardness conditions as described in section IV.C.2.e.
- (b) **RPA Results.** Results in units of micrograms per liter (µg/L) from effluent and upstream receiving water monitoring conducted by the Discharger are presented in the table below.

Effluent Sample Date	Method Detection Level (MDL)	Reporting Level (RL)	Zinc Effluent Result (µg/L)
2 October 2012	1.3	5	80
14 October 2013	0.5	0.000003	44
15 September 2014	2	0.000003	40

Receiving Water Sample Date	Method Detection Level (MDL)	Reporting Level (RL)	Zinc Receiving Water Result (µg/L)
2 October 2012	1.3	10	DNQ (1.8)
14 October 2013	0.5	20	DNQ (1)
15 September 2014	2	5	DNQ (3.8)

Analysis of the effluent data shows that an elevated concentration of 80 µg/L occurred prior to additional operational measures taken to improve treatment and after completion of work related to the 12 mgd expansion project in 2012. Improvements as a result of the Facility expansion project include, in part, enhanced preliminary, primary, and secondary sedimentation. Analysis of sampling conducted in 2013 and 2014 shows reduced concentrations with an MEC of 44 µg/L which is representative of effluent quality post Facility improvements. Additional monitoring data is necessary, however, to complete this determination. As a result, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct accelerated monitoring for zinc to determine whether the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria. The additional monitoring requirements for zinc are described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E. This Order includes a reopener provision for modification, or revocation and reissuance, as a result of the detection of zinc as described in Reopener Provisions section VI.C1.

- c. **Constituents with Reasonable Potential.** The Central Valley Water Board finds that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a water quality standard for ammonia, chlorodibromomethane, copper, dichlorobromomethane, and nitrate plus nitrite. WQBEL's for these constituents are included in this Order. A summary of the RPA is provided in Attachment G, and a detailed discussion of the RPA for each constituent is provided below.

i. **Ammonia**

- (a) **WQO.** The 1999 USEPA National Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NAWQC) for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for total ammonia (the “1999 Criteria”), recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum concentration or CMC) standards based on pH and chronic (30-day average; criteria continuous concentration or CCC) standards based on pH and temperature. USEPA also recommends that no 4-day average concentration should exceed 2.5 times the 30-day CCC.

The USEPA recently published national recommended water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life from the toxic effects of ammonia in freshwater (the “2013 Criteria”).<sup>1</sup> The 2013 Criteria is an update to USEPA’s 1999 Criteria, and varies based on pH and temperature. Although the 2013 Criteria reflects the latest scientific knowledge on the toxicity of ammonia to certain freshwater aquatic life, including new toxicity data on sensitive freshwater mussels in the family *Unionidae*, the species tested for development of the 2013 Criteria may not be present in some Central Valley waterways. The 2013 Criteria document therefore states that, “*unionid mussel species are not prevalent in some waters, such as the arid west ...*” and provides that, “*In the case of ammonia, where a state demonstrates that mussels are not present on a site-specific basis, the recalculation procedure may be used to remove the mussel species from the national criteria dataset to better represent the species present at the site.*”

The Central Valley Water Board issued a 3 April 2014 *California Water Code Section 13267 Order for Information: 2013 Final Ammonia Criteria for Protection of Freshwater Aquatic Life* (13267 Order) requiring the Discharger to either participate in an individual or group study to determine the presence of mussels or submit a method of compliance for complying with effluent limitations calculated assuming mussels present using the 2013 Criteria. The Discharger submitted a letter to the Central Valley Water Board indicating their participation in the Central Valley Clean Water Association Freshwater Collaborative Mussel Study. Studies are currently underway to determine how the latest scientific knowledge on the toxicity of ammonia reflected in the 2013 Criteria can be implemented in the Central Valley Region as part of a Basin Planning effort to adopt nutrient and ammonia objectives. Until the Basin Planning process is completed, the Central Valley Water Board will continue to implement the 1999 Criteria to interpret the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective. The 1999 NAWQC for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for total ammonia, recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum concentration or CMC) standards based on pH and chronic (30-day average; criteria continuous concentration or CCC) standards based on pH and temperature. USEPA also recommends that no 4-day average concentration should exceed 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. USEPA found that as pH increased, both the acute and chronic toxicity of ammonia increased. Salmonids were more sensitive to acute toxicity effects than other species. However, while the acute toxicity of ammonia was not influenced by temperature, it was found that invertebrates and young fish experienced increasing chronic toxicity effects with increasing

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. EPA, *Aquatic Life Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Ammonia – Freshwater*, EPA 822-R-13-001 (August 2013)

temperature. Because the Sacramento River has a beneficial use of cold freshwater habitat and the presence of salmonids and early fish life stages in the Sacramento River is well-documented, the recommended criteria for waters where salmonids and early life stages are present were used.

The maximum permitted effluent pH is 8.5 as the Basin Plan objective for pH in the receiving stream is the range of 6.5 to 8.5. In order to protect against the worst-case short-term exposure of an organism, a pH value of 8.5 was used to derive the acute criterion. The resulting acute criterion is 2.14 mg/L.

A chronic criterion was calculated for each day when paired temperature data and pH were measured using downstream receiving water data for temperature and pH. Rolling 30-day average criteria were calculated from downstream receiving water data using the criteria calculated for each day and the minimum observed 30-day average criterion was established as the applicable 30-day average chronic criterion, or 30-day CCC. The most stringent 30-day CCC was 1.4 mg/L (as N). The 4-day average concentration is derived in accordance with the U.S. EPA criterion as 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. Based on the 30-day CCC of 1.4 mg/L (as N), the 4-day average concentration that should not be exceeded is 3.5 mg/L.

- (b) **RPA Results.** The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia in concentrations that, without treatment, would be harmful to fish and would violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective if discharged to the receiving water. Reasonable potential therefore exists and effluent limitations are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, *“Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.”* For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Ammonia is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

USEPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, *“State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL's are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL's for pathogens in all permits for POTW's discharging to contact recreational waters).”* USEPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, *“When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where*

facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.” With regard to POTW’s, USEPA recommends that, “*POTW’s should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems.*” (TSD, p. 50)

Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrite and nitrite to nitrate. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrite or nitric oxide and then to nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. The Discharger currently uses nitrification to remove ammonia from the waste stream. Inadequate or incomplete nitrification may result in the discharge of ammonia to the receiving stream. Ammonia is known to cause toxicity to aquatic organisms in surface waters. Discharges of ammonia in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life would violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective. Although the Discharger nitrifies the discharge, inadequate or incomplete nitrification creates the potential for ammonia to be discharged and provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge has reasonable potential for ammonia and WQBEL’s are required.

- (c) **WQBEL’s.** The Central Valley Water Board calculates WQBEL’s in accordance with SIP procedures for non-CTR constituents, and ammonia is a non-CTR constituent. The SIP procedure assumes a 4-day averaging period for calculating the long-term average discharge condition (LTA). However, USEPA recommends modifying the procedure for calculating permit limits for ammonia using a 30-day averaging period for the calculation of the LTA corresponding to the 30-day CCC. Therefore, while the LTAs corresponding to the acute and 4-day chronic criteria were calculated according to SIP procedures, the LTA corresponding to the 30-day CCC was calculated assuming a 30-day averaging period. The lowest LTA representing the acute, 4-day CCC, and 30-day CCC is then selected for deriving the average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and the average weekly effluent limitation (AWEL). The remainder of the WQBEL calculation for ammonia was performed according to the SIP procedures. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for ammonia of 8.2 mg/L and 17.6 mg/L, respectively, based on the NAWQC and acute and chronic criteria mixing zones granted with corresponding dilution credits of 12.2 and 4.7, respectively.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that an MEC of 11.55 mg/L occurred prior to additional operational measures taken to improve secondary-level treatment and after completion of work related to the 12 mgd expansion project in 2012. The Facility expansion project included, in part, improvements to secondary-level treatment and nitrification. Analysis of effluent data from December 2012 through July 2015 shows that the MEC of 1.96 mg/L is representative of nitrification capabilities at the Facility which is less than the applicable WQBEL’s. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

ii. **Chlorine Residual**

- (a) **WQO.** USEPA developed NAWQC for protection of freshwater aquatic life for chlorine residual. The recommended 4-day average (chronic) and 1-hour average (acute) criteria for chlorine residual are 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively. These criteria are protective of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The concentrations of chlorine used to disinfect wastewater are high enough to harm aquatic life and violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective if discharged to the receiving water. Reasonable potential therefore does exist and effluent limits are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*" For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Chlorine is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used its judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

USEPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL's are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL's for pathogens in all permits for POTW's discharging to contact recreational waters).*" USEPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, "*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.*" With regard to POTW's, USEPA recommends that, "*POTW's should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems.*" (TSD, p. 50)

The Discharger uses chlorine for disinfection, which is extremely toxic to aquatic organisms. Although the Discharger uses a sulfur dioxide process to dechlorinate the effluent prior to discharge to the Sacramento River, the existing chlorine use and the potential for chlorine to be discharged provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC.

- (c) **WQBEL's.** The USEPA *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-Based Toxics Control* [EPA/505/2-90-001] contains statistical methods for

converting chronic (4-day) and acute (1-hour) aquatic life criteria to average monthly and maximum daily effluent limitations based on the variability of the existing data and the expected frequency of monitoring. However, because chlorine is an acutely toxic constituent that can and will be monitored continuously, an average 1-hour limitation is considered more appropriate than an average daily limitation. This Order contains a 4-day average effluent limitation and 1-hour average effluent limitation for chlorine residual of 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively, based on USEPA's NAWQC, which implements the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective for protection of aquatic life.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of effluent data shows that the Facility is capable of meeting the applicable WQBEL's. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

### iii. Chlorodibromomethane

- (a) **WQO.** The The CTR includes a criterion of 0.41 µg/L for chlorodibromomethane for the protection of human health for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for chlorodibromomethane was 3.0 µg/L based on 39 samples collected between July 2012 and July 2015. Chlorodibromomethane was not detected in the upstream receiving water based on 39 samples collected between July 2012 and July 2015 (MDL 0.049 µg/L). Therefore, chlorodibromomethane in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
- (c) **WQBEL's.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for chlorodibromomethane; therefore, a human health dilution credit of 46.5:1 was allowed in the development of the WQBELs for chlorodibromomethane. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for chlorodibromomethane of 17.2 µg/L and 34 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health...
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of effluent data shows that the MEC is 3.0 µg/L which is less than the applicable WQBELs. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

### iv. Copper

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes hardness dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for copper. These criteria for copper are presented in dissolved concentrations, as 1-hour acute criteria and 4-day chronic criteria. Default USEPA translators (i.e., 0.96 for acute and chronic criteria) were used in this Order. As discussed in section IV.C.2, the design ambient hardness for calculating the CTR criteria is an ambient hardness of 62 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>). Using the design hardness of 62 mg/L (as CaCO<sub>3</sub>) the hardness dependent acute and chronic criteria for total recoverable copper are 8.9 µg/L and 6.2 µg/L, respectively.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for copper was 8.9 µg/L based on 37 samples collected between July 2012 and July 2015. Copper was detected at a maximum concentration of 4.7 µg/L in the upstream receiving water based

on 39 samples collected between July 2012 and July 2015. Therefore, copper in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.

- (c) **WQBEL's.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for copper; therefore, an acute and chronic criteria dilution credit of 2.7:1 and 6.6:1, respectively, was allowed in the development of the WQBELs for copper. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for copper of 15 µg/L and 20 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health...
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of effluent data shows that the MEC is 8.9 µg/L which is less than the applicable WQBELs. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

v. **Dichlorobromomethane**

- (e) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 0.56 µg/L for dichlorobromomethane for the protection of human health for waters from which both water and organisms are consumed.
- (f) **RPA Results.** The MEC for dichlorobromomethane was 20.0 µg/L based on 39 samples collected between July 2012 and July 2015. Dichlorobromomethane was not detected in the upstream receiving water based on 39 samples collected between July 2012 and July 2015 (MDL 0.031 µg/L). Therefore, dichlorobromomethane in the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.
- (g) **WQBEL's.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for dichlorobromomethane; therefore, a human health dilution credit of 46.5:1 was allowed in the development of the WQBELs for dichlorobromomethane. This Order contains a final average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL) for dichlorobromomethane of 25.2 µg/L and 43 µg/L, respectively, based on the CTR criterion for the protection of human health...
- (h) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of effluent data shows that the MEC is 20.0 µg/L which is less than the applicable WQBEL's. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

vi. **Nitrate and Nitrite**

- (a) **WQO.** DPH has adopted Primary MCLs for the protection of human health for nitrite and nitrate that are equal to 1 mg/L and 10 mg/L (measured as nitrogen), respectively. DPH has also adopted a Primary MCL of 10 mg/L for the sum of nitrate and nitrite, measured as nitrogen.

USEPA has developed a primary MCL and an MCL goal of 1 mg/L for nitrite (as nitrogen). For nitrate, USEPA has developed Drinking Water Standards (10 mg/L as Primary MCL) and NAWQC for protection of human health (10 mg/L for non-cancer health effects).

- (b) **RPA Results.** The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia in concentrations that,

if untreated, will be harmful to fish and will violate the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. This Order, therefore, requires removal of ammonia (i.e., nitrification). Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrate and nitrite, and will result in effluent nitrate concentrations above the Primary MCL for nitrate plus nitrite. Nitrate concentrations in a drinking water supply above the Primary MCL threatens the health of human fetuses and newborn babies by reducing the oxygen-carrying capacity of the blood (methemoglobinemia). Reasonable potential for nitrate and nitrite therefore exists and WQBEL's are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*" For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Nitrate and nitrite are not priority pollutants. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

USEPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL's are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL's for pathogens in all permits for POTW's discharging to contact recreational waters).*" USEPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, "When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data." With regard to POTW'S, USEPA recommends that, "POTW's should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems." (TSD, p. 50)

The concentration of nitrogen in raw domestic wastewater is sufficiently high that the resultant treated wastewater has a reasonable potential to exceed or threaten to exceed the Primary MCL for nitrate plus nitrite unless the wastewater is treated for nitrogen removal, and therefore an effluent limit for nitrate plus nitrite is required. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrite or nitric oxide and then to nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. Inadequate or incomplete denitrification may result in the discharge of nitrate and/or nitrite to the receiving stream. Discharges of nitrate plus nitrite in

concentrations that exceed the Primary MCL would violate the Basin Plan narrative chemical constituents objective. Inadequate or incomplete denitrification creates the potential for nitrate and nitrite to be discharged and provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Primary MCL. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge has reasonable potential for nitrate plus nitrite and WQBEL's are required.

- (c) **WQBEL's.** The receiving water contains assimilative capacity for nitrate plus nitrite, therefore, a dilution credit of 5:1 was allowed in the development of the WQBEL's for nitrate plus nitrite. This Order contains an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and average weekly effluent limitation (AWEL) or nitrate plus nitrite of 60 µg/L and 104 µg/L, respectively, based on the Basin Plan's narrative chemical constituents objective for protection of the MUN beneficial use. These effluent limitations are included in this Order to assure the treatment process adequately nitrifies and denitrifies the waste stream to protect the beneficial use of municipal and domestic supply.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the maximum effluent nitrate concentration of 30 mg/L (as N) is less than the applicable WQBELs. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board concludes that immediate compliance with these effluent limits is feasible.

vii. **Pathogens**

- (a) **WQO.** In a letter to the Central Valley Water Board dated 8 April 1999, DDW indicated it would consider wastewater discharged to water bodies with identified beneficial uses of irrigation or contact recreation and where the wastewater receives dilution of more than 20:1 to be adequately disinfected if the effluent coliform concentration does not exceed 23 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median and if the effluent coliform concentration does not exceed 240 MPN/100 mL more than once in any 30 day period.
- (b) **RPA Results.** Municipal and domestic supply, agricultural irrigation, and body contact water recreation are beneficial uses of the Sacramento River. Based on a review of data submitted by the Discharger and the period of record for the United States Geological Survey monitoring stations on the Sacramento River, a dilution of greater than 20:1 was available at all times. Therefore, the DDW requirements are applicable to the discharge.
- (c) **WQBEL's.** Pursuant to guidance from DDW, this Order includes effluent limitations for total coliform organisms of 23 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median and 240 MPN/100 mL, not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period. These coliform limits are imposed to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water, including public health through contact recreation and drinking water pathways.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows that the treatment plant is capable of meeting the WQBEL's.

viii. **pH**

- (a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective for surface waters (except for Goose Lake) that the “...*pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5.*”
- (b) **RPA Results.** Raw domestic wastewater inherently has variable pH. Additionally, some wastewater treatment processes can increase or decrease wastewater pH which if not properly controlled, would violate the Basin Plan’s numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, reasonable potential exists for pH and WQBEL’s are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, “*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*” For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. pH is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

USEPA’s September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, page 6-30, states, “*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL’s are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL’s for pathogens in all permits for POTW’s discharging to contact recreational waters).*” USEPA’s TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, “*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.*” (TSD, p. 50)

The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Based on continuous daily sampling taken from July 2012 to July 2015, the maximum pH reported was 7.5 and the minimum was 6.38 standard units. Although the Discharger has proper pH controls in place, the pH for the Facility’s influent varies due to the nature of municipal sewage, which provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan’s numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, WQBEL’s for pH are required in this Order.

- (c) **WQBEL’s.** Effluent limitations for pH of 6.0 as an instantaneous minimum and 8.5 as an instantaneous maximum are included in this Order based on protection of the Basin Plan objectives for pH.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of effluent data demonstrates that the Facility can immediately comply with the WQBEL's.

ix. **Salinity**

- (a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan contains a chemical constituent objective that incorporates state MCLs, contains a narrative objective, and contains numeric water quality objectives for certain specified water bodies for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, sulfate, and chloride. The USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Chloride recommends acute and chronic criteria for the protection of aquatic life. There are no USEPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, and sulfate. Additionally, there are no USEPA numeric water quality criteria for the protection of agricultural, livestock, and industrial uses. Numeric values for the protection of these uses are typically based on site specific conditions and evaluations to determine the appropriate constituent threshold necessary to interpret the narrative chemical constituent Basin Plan objective. The Central Valley Water Board must determine the applicable numeric limit to implement the narrative objective for the protection of agricultural supply. The Central Valley Water Board is currently implementing the CV-SALTS initiative to develop a Basin Plan Amendment that will establish a salt and nitrate Management Plan for the Central Valley. Through this effort the Basin Plan will be amended to define how the narrative water quality objective is to be interpreted for the protection of agricultural use. All studies conducted through this Order to establish an agricultural limit to implement the narrative objective will be reviewed by and consistent with the efforts currently underway by CV SALTS.

**Table F-12. Salinity Water Quality Criteria/Objectives**

Parameter	Agricultural WQ Objective <sup>1</sup>	Secondary MCL <sup>2</sup>	USEPA NAWQC	Effluent	
				Average <sup>3</sup>	Maximum
EC (µmhos/cm)	Varies <sup>2</sup>	900, 1600, 2200	N/A	701	910
TDS (mg/L)	Varies	500, 1000, 1500	N/A	458	514
Sulfate (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	N/A	37	54
Chloride (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	860 1-hr 230 4-day	72	80

<sup>1</sup> Narrative chemical constituent objective of the Basin Plan. Procedures for establishing the applicable numeric limitation to implement the narrative objective can be found in the Policy for Application of Water Quality, Chapter IV, Section 8 of the Basin Plan., However, the Basin Plan does not require improvement over naturally occurring background concentrations. In cases where the natural background concentration of a particular constituent exceeds an applicable water quality objective, the natural background concentration will be considered to comply with the objective.

<sup>2</sup> The secondary MCLs are stated as a recommended level, upper level, and a short-term maximum level.

<sup>3</sup> Maximum calendar annual average.

- (1) **Chloride.** The Secondary MCL for chloride is 250 mg/L, as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.

- (2) **Electrical Conductivity.** The Secondary MCL for EC is 900  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$  as a recommended level, 1600  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$  as an upper level, and 2200  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$  as a short-term maximum. The Basin Plan contains a site-specific EC limit of 230 micromhos/cm (50 percentile) or 235 micromhos/cm (90 percentile) at Knights Landing above Colusa Basin Drain; or 240 micromhos/cm (50 percentile) or 340 micromhos/cm (90 percentile) at I Street Bridge, based upon previous 10 years of record for the Sacramento River.
- (3) **Sulfate.** The Secondary MCL for sulfate is 250 mg/L as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.
- (4) **Total Dissolved Solids.** The Secondary MCL for TDS is 500 mg/L as a recommended level, 1000 mg/L as an upper level, and 1500 mg/L as a short-term maximum.

(b) **RPA Results**

- (1) **Chloride.** Chloride concentrations in the effluent ranged from 66 mg/L to 80 mg/L, with an average of 72 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in Sacramento River ranged from 2.4 mg/L to 3 mg/L, with an average of 2.7 mg/L, for four samples collected by the Discharger from October 2012 through September 2014.
  - (2) **Electrical Conductivity.** A review of the Discharger's monitoring reports shows an average effluent EC of 701  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ , with a range from 520  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$  to 910  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ . The annual average levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. The background receiving water EC averaged 125  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ .
  - (3) **Sulfate.** Sulfate concentrations in the effluent ranged from 16 mg/L to 54 mg/L, with an average of 37 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in Sacramento River ranged from 0.09 mg/L to 34 mg/L, with an average of 5.7 mg/L.
  - (4) **Total Dissolved Solids.** The average TDS effluent concentration was 458 mg/L with concentrations ranging from 420 mg/L to 514 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. The background receiving water TDS ranged from 68 mg/L to 100 mg/L, with an average of 86 mg/L.
- (c) **WQBEL's.** Effluent limitations based on the MCL or the Basin Plan would likely require construction and operation of a reverse osmosis treatment plant. The State Water Board, in Order WQ 2005-005 (*City of Manteca*), stated, "...the State Board takes official notice [pursuant to Title 23 of California Code of Regulations, Section 648.2] of the fact that operation of a large-scale reverse osmosis treatment plant would result in production of highly saline brine for which an acceptable method of disposal would have to be developed. Consequently, any decision that would require use of reverse osmosis to treat the City's municipal wastewater effluent on a large scale should involve thorough consideration of the expected environmental effects." The State Water Board stated in that Order, "Although the ultimate solution to southern Delta salinity problems have not yet been determined, previous actions establish that the State Board intended for permit limitations to play a limited role with respect to

*achieving compliance with the EC water quality objectives in the southern Delta.” The State Water Board continued, “Construction and operation of reverse osmosis facilities to treat discharges...prior to implementation of other measures to reduce the salt load in the southern Delta, would not be a reasonable approach.”*

The Central Valley Water Board, with cooperation of the State Water Board, has begun the process to develop a new policy for the regulation of salinity in the Central Valley. In a statement issued at the 16 March 2006, Central Valley Water Board meeting, Board Member Dr. Karl Longley recommended that the Central Valley Water Board continue to exercise its authority to regulate discharges of salt to minimize salinity increases within the Central Valley. Dr. Longley stated, *“The process of developing new salinity control policies does not, therefore, mean that we should stop regulating salt discharges until a salinity Policy is developed. In the meantime, the Board should consider all possible interim approaches to continue controlling and regulating salts in a reasonable manner, and encourage all stakeholder groups that may be affected by the Regional Board’s policy to actively participate in policy development.”*

Based on the relatively low reported salinity, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion of water quality objectives for salinity. However, since the Discharger discharges to the Sacramento River and eventually the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, of additional concern is the salt contribution to Delta waters. Allowing the Discharger to increase its current salt loading may be contrary to the Region-wide effort to address salinity in the Central Valley. In order to ensure that the Discharger will continue to control the discharge of salinity, this Order includes a salinity evaluation and minimization plan (SEMP) annual update report requirement to continue to implement the existing SEMP. Also water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the relative contribution of salinity from the source water to the effluent.

#### 4. WQBEL Calculations

- a. **Effluent Concentration Allowance.** For each water quality criterion/objective, the ECA is calculated using the following steady-state mass balance equation from Section 1.4 of the SIP:

$$\begin{array}{ll} ECA = C + D(C - B) & \text{where } C > B, \text{ and} \\ ECA = C & \text{where } C \leq B \end{array}$$

where:

ECA = effluent concentration allowance  
D = dilution credit  
C = the priority pollutant criterion/objective  
B = the ambient background concentration.

According to the SIP, the ambient background concentration (B) in the equation above shall be the observed maximum with the exception that an ECA calculated from a priority pollutant criterion/objective that is intended to protect human health from carcinogenic effects shall use the arithmetic mean concentration of the ambient background samples. For ECAs based on MCLs, which implement the Basin Plan’s

chemical constituents objective and are applied as annual averages, an arithmetic mean is also used for B due to the long-term basis of the criteria.

- b. **Basin Plan Objectives and MCLs.** For WQBEL's based on site-specific numeric Basin Plan objectives or MCLs, the effluent limitations are applied directly as the ECA as either an MDEL, AMEL, or average annual effluent limitations, depending on the averaging period of the objective.
- c. **Aquatic Toxicity Criteria.** WQBEL's based on acute and chronic aquatic toxicity criteria are calculated in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECAs are converted to equivalent long-term averages (i.e. LTA<sub>acute</sub> and LTA<sub>chronic</sub>) using statistical multipliers and the lowest LTA is used to calculate the AMEL and MDEL using additional statistical multipliers.
- d. **Human Health Criteria.** WQBEL's based on human health criteria, are also calculated in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP. The AMEL is set equal to ECA and a statistical multiplier was used to calculate the MDEL.

$$AMEL = mult_{AMEL} \left[ \min \left( \overbrace{M_A ECA_{acute}}^{LTA_{acute}}, M_C ECA_{chronic} \right) \right]$$

$$MDEL = mult_{MDEL} \left[ \min \left( M_A ECA_{acute}, \underbrace{M_C ECA_{chronic}}_{LTA_{chronic}} \right) \right]$$

$$MDEL_{HH} = \left( \frac{mult_{MDEL}}{mult_{AMEL}} \right) AMEL_{HH}$$

where:

- $mult_{AMEL}$  = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL
- $mult_{MDEL}$  = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL
- $M_A$  = statistical multiplier converting acute ECA to LTA<sub>acute</sub>
- $M_C$  = statistical multiplier converting chronic ECA to LTA<sub>chronic</sub>

### Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations Discharge Point No. D-001

**Table F-10. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Ammonia	mg/L (as N)	8.2	17.6			
Chlorine Residual	mg/L					
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	15		20		
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	17.2		34		
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	25.2		43		
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/ 100 mL		23 (7-day median)	240 (30-day)		

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Nitrate plus Nitrite	mg/L (as N)	60	104			
pH	standard units				6.0	8.5

## 5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

For compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct whole effluent toxicity testing for acute and chronic toxicity, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E section V.). This Order also contains effluent limitations for acute toxicity and requires the Discharger to implement best management practices to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity.

- a. **Acute Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00). The Basin Plan also states that, “*...effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed where appropriate...*”.

For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Acute toxicity is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Acute whole effluent toxicity is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA. USEPA’s September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, page 6-30, states, “*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBEL’s are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBEL’s for pathogens in all permits for POTW’s discharging to contact recreational waters).*” Although the discharge has been consistently in compliance with the acute effluent limitations, the Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater containing ammonia and other acutely toxic pollutants. Acute toxicity effluent limits are required to ensure compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

USEPA Region 9 provided guidance for the development of acute toxicity effluent limitations in the absence of numeric water quality objectives for toxicity in its document titled "Guidance for NPDES Permit Issuance", dated February 1994. In section B.2. "Toxicity Requirements" (pgs. 14-15) it states that, "*In the absence of specific numeric water quality objectives for acute and chronic toxicity, the narrative criterion 'no toxics in toxic amounts' applies. Achievement of the narrative criterion, as applied herein, means that ambient waters shall not demonstrate for acute toxicity: 1) less than 90% survival, 50% of the time, based on the monthly median, or 2) less than 70% survival, 10% of the time, based on any monthly median. For chronic toxicity, ambient waters shall not demonstrate a test result of greater than 1 [chronic toxic unit].*" Accordingly, effluent limitations for acute toxicity have been included in this Order as follows:

**Acute Toxicity.** Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:

- Minimum for any one bioassay----- 70%
- Median for any three consecutive bioassays ----- 90%

- b. **Chronic Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00). As shown in the table below, based on chronic WET testing performed by the Discharger from 2010 through 2014, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

**Table F-11. Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results**

	Fathead Minnow		Water Flea		Green Algae
	<i>Pimephales promelas</i>		<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>		<i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i>
Date	Survival (TUc)	Growth (TUc)	Survival (TUc)	Reproduction (TUc)	Growth (TUc)
2010	1	1	1	1	1
2011	1	1	1	1	1
2012	1	1	1	1	1
2013	1	1	1	1	1
2014	1	1	1	1	1

The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires annual chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. In addition to WET monitoring, the Special Provision in section VI.C.2.a of the Order requires the Discharger to submit to the Central Valley Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE Workplan for approval by the Executive Officer, to ensure the Discharger has a plan to immediately move forward with the initial tiers of a TRE, in the event effluent toxicity is encountered in the future. The provision also includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, requirements for accelerated monitoring, and requirements for TRE initiation if toxicity is demonstrated.

Numeric chronic WET effluent limitations have not been included in this Order. The SIP contains implementation gaps regarding the appropriate form and implementation of chronic toxicity limits. This has resulted in the petitioning of a NPDES permit in the Los Angeles Region<sup>1</sup> that contained numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations. To address the petitions, the State Water Board adopted WQO 2003-012 directing its staff to revise the toxicity control provisions in the SIP. The State Water Board states the following in WQO 2003-012, “In reviewing this petition and receiving comments from numerous interested persons on the propriety of including numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity in NPDES permits for publicly-owned treatment works that discharge to inland waters, we have determined that this issue should be considered in a regulatory setting, in order to allow for full public discussion and deliberation. We intend to modify the SIP to specifically address the issue. We anticipate that review will occur within the next year. We therefore decline to make a determination here regarding the propriety of the final numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity contained in these permits.” The process to revise the SIP is currently underway.

<sup>1</sup> State Water Board Order WQO 2003-012 (*Los Coyotes and Long Beach Wastewater Reclamation Plants*). <sup>1</sup> CalRecycle has proposed to define “anaerobically digestible material” to include inedible kitchen grease as defined in Food and Agricultural Code section 19216, food material as defined in California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 17852 and vegetative food material.

Proposed changes include clarifying the appropriate form of effluent toxicity limits in NPDES permits and general expansion and standardization of toxicity control implementation related to the NPDES permitting process. Since the toxicity control provisions in the SIP are under revision it is infeasible to develop numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity. Therefore, this Order requires that the Discharger meet best management practices for compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, as allowed under 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(k).

To ensure compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, the Discharger is required to conduct chronic WET testing, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E section V.). Furthermore, the Special Provision contained at VI.C.2.a. of this Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify and implement corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge demonstrates toxicity exceeding the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger is required to initiate a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) in accordance with an approved TRE workplan. The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to perform accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, as well as, the threshold to initiate a TRE if effluent toxicity has been demonstrated.

#### **D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations**

##### **1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations**

40 C.F.R section 122.45(f)(1) requires effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass, with some exceptions, and 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(2) allows pollutants that are limited in terms of mass to additionally be limited in terms of other units of measurement. This Order includes effluent limitations expressed in terms of mass and concentration. In addition, pursuant to the exceptions to mass limitations provided in 40 C.F.R. section 122.45(f)(1), some effluent limitations are not expressed in terms of mass, such as pH and temperature, and when the applicable standards are expressed in terms of concentration (e.g., CTR criteria and MCL's) and mass limitations are not necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

Mass-based effluent limitations were calculated based upon the design flow (Average Dry Weather Flow) permitted in section IV.A.1.f of this Order.

##### **2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations**

40 C.F.R. section 122.45 (d) requires average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations for POTW's unless impracticable. However, for toxic pollutants and pollutant parameters in water quality permitting, USEPA recommends the use of a maximum daily effluent limitation in lieu of average weekly effluent limitations for two reasons. *"First, the basis for the 7-day average for POTW's derives from the secondary treatment requirements. This basis is not related to the need for assuring achievement of water quality standards. Second, a 7-day average, which could comprise up to seven or more daily samples, could average out peak toxic concentrations and therefore the discharge's potential for causing acute toxic effects would be missed."* (TSD, pg. 96) This Order uses maximum daily effluent limitations in lieu of average weekly effluent limitations for copper, chlorodibromomethane, and dichlorobromomethane as recommended by the TSD for the achievement of water quality standards and for the protection of the beneficial uses of the receiving stream. Furthermore, for BOD, TSS, ammonia, chlorine residual, nitrate and nitrite, pH, and total coliform organisms weekly average effluent limitations have been replaced or supplemented with effluent limitations utilizing shorter averaging periods. The rationale for using shorter averaging periods for these constituents is discussed in section IV.C of this Fact Sheet.

### 3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements

The CWA specifies that a revised permit may not include effluent limitations that are less stringent than the previous permit unless a less stringent limitation is justified based on exceptions to the anti-backsliding provisions contained in CWA sections 402(o) or 303(d)(4), or, where applicable, 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l).

All effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous Order.

- a. **CWA section 402(o)(1) and 303(d)(4).** CWA section 402(o)(1) prohibits the establishment of less stringent water quality-based effluent limits “*except in compliance with Section 303(d)(4).*” CWA section 303(d)(4) has two parts: paragraph (A) which applies to nonattainment waters and paragraph (B) which applies to attainment waters.
  - i. For waters where standards are not attained, CWA section 304(d)(4)(A) specifies that any effluent limit based on a TMDL or other Waste Load Allocation (WLA) may be revised only if the cumulative effect of all such revised effluent limits based on such TMDL’s or WLAs will assure the attainment of such water quality standards.
  - ii. For attainment waters, CWA section 303(d)(4)(B) specifies that a limitation based on a water quality standard may be relaxed where the action is consistent with the antidegradation policy.
- b. **CWA section 402(o)(2).** CWA section 402(o)(2) provides several exceptions to the anti-backsliding regulations. CWA 402(o)(2)(B)(i) allows a renewed, reissued, or modified permit to contain a less stringent effluent limitation for a pollutant if information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance.

### 4. Antidegradation Policies

This Order does not allow for an increase in flow or mass of pollutants to the receiving water. Therefore, a complete antidegradation analysis is not necessary. The Order requires compliance with applicable federal technology-based standards and with WQBEL’s where the discharge could have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards. The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and the State Anti-Degradation Policy. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

- a. **Surface Water.** The permitted surface water discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.
- b. **Groundwater.** The Discharger utilizes evaporation/percolation final disposal ponds for secondary treated and disinfected effluent. Domestic wastewater contains constituents such as total dissolved solids (TDS), specific conductivity, pathogens, nitrates, organics, metals and oxygen demanding substances (BOD). Percolation from the disposal ponds may result in an increase in the concentration of these constituents in groundwater. The *State Anti-Degradation Policy* generally prohibits the Central Valley Water Board from authorizing activities that will result in the degradation of high-quality waters unless it has been shown that:

- i. The degradation will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in state and regional policies, including violation of one or more water quality objectives;
- ii. The degradation will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated future beneficial uses;
- iii. The discharger will employ Best Practicable Treatment or Control (BPTC) to minimize degradation; and
- iv. The degradation is consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the state.

Some degradation of groundwater may be consistent with the State Anti-Degradation Policy provided that the Discharger is implementing best practicable treatment or control (BPTC) measures. The Facility is designed and constructed to provide secondary level treatment and disinfection to treat municipal domestic wastewater prior to discharge. This level of treatment may result in limited groundwater degradation not exceeding water quality objectives. Providing wastewater treatment to the community is in the best interest of the people of the state. The Discharger's treatment constitutes best practicable treatment or control and complies with the State Anti-Degradation Policy.

This Order requires the Discharger to install groundwater monitoring wells and conduct groundwater characterization in order to complete an antidegradation reevaluation as specified in Special Provisions section VI.C.2 of this Order. Groundwater monitoring, as specified in the MRP (see Attachment E of this Order), along with the antidegradation reevaluation will be used to evaluate degradation, if any, to the groundwater quality when compared to background as a result of the discharge. Groundwater limitations have been included in this order (at or below) the water quality objective for protection of the domestic or municipal supply (MUN) beneficial use of groundwater.

This Order establishes land discharge specifications for BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, and total coliform organisms consistent with treatment capabilities at the Facility for the protection of designated and anticipated beneficial uses of groundwater and in accordance with the State Anti-Degradation Policy.

## **5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants**

This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBEL's for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD<sub>5</sub>, pH, and TSS. Restrictions on same pollutants are discussed in section IV.B.2 of this Fact Sheet. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations more stringent than the minimum, federal technology-based requirements that are necessary to meet water quality standards. These requirements include some limitations that are more stringent than required by the CWA.

WQBEL's have been derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that toxic pollutant WQBEL's were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The procedures for calculating the individual water quality-based effluent limitations for priority pollutants are based on the CTR implemented by the SIP, which was approved by U.S. EPA on 18 May 2000. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by U.S. EPA prior to 30 May

2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to U.S. EPA prior to 30 May 2000, but not approved by U.S. EPA before that date, are nonetheless “applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA” pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order’s restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the requirements of the CWA.

This Order contains pollutant restrictions that are more stringent than applicable federal requirements and standards. Specifically, this Order includes effluent limitations for pH that are more stringent than applicable federal standards, but that are nonetheless necessary to meet numeric objectives or protect beneficial uses. The rationale for including these limitations is explained in section IV.C.3

**Summary of Final Effluent Limitations**

**Discharge Point D-001**

**Table F-12. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations**

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis <sup>1</sup>
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	
Flow	mgd	12 (ADWF)					DC
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mgd	30	45	90			CFR
	lbs/day	3002	4504	9007			CFR
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	30	45	90			CFR
	lbs/day	3002	4504	9007			CFR
pH	Standard units				6.0	8.5	BP
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	17.2		34			CTR
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	15		20			CTR
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	8.2	17.6				NAWQC
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	25.2		43			CTR
Nitrate plus Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	60	104				MCL

<sup>1</sup> DC – Based on the design capacity of the Facility.  
TTC – Based on tertiary treatment capability. These effluent limitations reflect the capability of a properly operated tertiary treatment plant.  
CFR – Based on secondary treatment standards contained in 40 C.F.R. part 133.  
BP – Based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan.  
CTR – Based on water quality criteria contained in the California Toxics Rule and applied as specified in the SIP.  
NAWQC – Based on USEPA’s National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.  
SEC MCL – Based on the Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level.  
TMDL – Based on the TMDL for salinity and boron in the lower San Joaquin River.  
MCL – Based on the Primary Maximum Contaminant Level.  
Title 22 – Based on CA Department of Public Health Reclamation Criteria, CCR, Division 4, Chapter 3 (Title 22).

**E. Land Discharge Specifications**

- 1. Land Discharge Specifications IV.B.1.a-e.** As described in section IV.D.4.b of this Fact Sheet, discharges from the Facility have the potential to impact groundwater and are subject to applicable state regulatory requirements that include, in part, compliance

with State Anti-Degradation Policy. Some degradation of groundwater may be consistent with the State Anti-Degradation Policy provided that the Discharger is implementing best practicable treatment or control (BPTC) measures. The Facility is designed and constructed to provide secondary level treatment and disinfection to treat municipal domestic wastewater prior to discharge. This level of treatment may result in limited groundwater degradation not exceeding water quality objectives. Providing wastewater treatment to the community is in the best interest of the people of the state. The Discharger's treatment constitutes best practicable treatment or control and complies with the State Anti-Degradation Policy. This Order establishes land discharge specifications for BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, and total coliform organisms consistent with treatment capabilities at the Facility for the protection of designated and anticipated beneficial uses of groundwater and in accordance with the State Anti-Degradation Policy.

**F. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable**

**V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS**

**A. Surface Water**

1. CWA section 303(a)-(c), requires states to adopt water quality standards, including criteria where they are necessary to protect beneficial uses. The Central Valley Water Board adopted water quality criteria as water quality objectives in the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan states that “[t]he numerical and narrative water quality objectives define the least stringent standards that the Regional Water Board will apply to regional waters in order to protect the beneficial uses.” The Basin Plan includes numeric and narrative water quality objectives for various beneficial uses and water bodies. This Order contains receiving surface water limitations based on the Basin Plan numerical and narrative water quality objectives for bacteria, biostimulatory substances, color, chemical constituents, dissolved oxygen, floating material, oil and grease, pH, pesticides, radioactivity, salinity, suspended sediment, settleable substances, suspended material, tastes and odors, temperature, toxicity, and turbidity.

**B. Groundwater**

1. The beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater are municipal and domestic supply, industrial service supply, industrial process supply, and agricultural supply.
2. Basin Plan water quality objectives include narrative objectives for chemical constituents, tastes and odors, and toxicity of groundwater. The toxicity objective requires that groundwater be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in humans, plants, animals, or aquatic life. The chemical constituent objective states groundwater shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect any beneficial use. The tastes and odors objective prohibits taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. The Basin Plan also establishes numerical water quality objectives for chemical constituents and radioactivity in groundwaters designated as municipal supply. These include, at a minimum, compliance with MCLs in Title 22 of the CCR. The bacteria objective prohibits coliform organisms at or above 2.2 MPN/100 mL. The Basin Plan requires the application of the most stringent objective necessary to ensure that waters do not contain chemical constituents, toxic substances, radionuclides, taste- or odor-producing substances, or bacteria in concentrations that adversely affect municipal or domestic supply, agricultural supply, industrial supply or some other beneficial use.
3. Nitrate, which was found to be present in the wastewater at an average concentration of up to 22 mg/L as nitrogen, has the potential to degrade groundwater quality because there is little ability for attenuation in the shallow permeable vadose zone beneath the Facility. The Chemical Constituents objective prohibits concentrations of chemical

constituents in excess of California MCLs in groundwater that is designated as municipal or domestic supply. The California primary MCL for nitrate is equivalent to 10 mg/L as nitrogen, and groundwater beneath the facility is designated as municipal or domestic supply. It is therefore appropriate to adopt a numerical groundwater limitation of 10 mg/L for nitrate as nitrogen to implement the Chemical Constituents objective to protect the municipal and domestic use of groundwater.

4. Groundwater limitations are required to protect the beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater.

## VI. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

### A. Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under section 122.42.

Sections 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) of 40 C.F.R. establish conditions that apply to all state-issued NPDES permits. These conditions must be incorporated into the permits either expressly or by reference. If incorporated by reference, a specific citation to the regulations must be included in the Order. Section 123.25(a)(12) of 40 C.F.R. allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2) because the enforcement authority under the Water Code is more stringent. In lieu of these conditions, this Order incorporates by reference Water Code section 13387(e).

### B. Special Provisions

#### 1. Reopener Provisions

- a. **Mercury.** This provision allows the Central Valley Water Board to reopen this Order in the event mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted. In addition, this Order may be reopened if the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for dischargers subject to NPDES permits.
- b. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** This Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity through a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE). This Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if a numeric chronic toxicity water quality objective is adopted by the State Water Board, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation based on that objective.
- c. **Water Effects Ratio (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable inorganic constituents. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable when developing effluent limitations for copper. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
- d. **Drinking Water Policy.** On 26 July 2013 the Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution No. R5-2013-0098 amending the Basin Plan and establishing a Drinking

Water Policy. The State Water Board approved the Drinking Water Policy on 3 December 2013. This Order may be reopened to incorporate monitoring of drinking water constituents to implement the Drinking Water Policy.

- e. **Diazinon and Chlorpyrifos Basin Plan Amendment.** Central Valley Water Board staff is developing a Basin Plan Amendment to provide an implementation plan for NPDES-permitted domestic wastewater dischargers. This Order may be reopened to modify diazinon and chlorpyrifos effluent limitations, as appropriate, in accordance with an amendment to the Basin Plan.
- f. **Cyanide.** This Order may be reopened and modified as necessary if monitoring results indicate that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard.
- g. **M&T Irrigation Canal Outfall.** The M&T Irrigation Canal Outfall has served as a historic, but inactive, discharge location for the Facility. Discharges to this outfall have not occurred in the past 30 years, and information necessary to establish appropriate waste discharge requirements is not available. Therefore, discharges to the M&T Irrigation Canal are prohibited until the Discharger provides information necessary to determine appropriate waste discharge requirements in order to protect public health and water quality. This Order includes a reopener provision for modification, or revocation and reissuance, to consider reinstating the M&T Irrigation Canal Outfall as a permitted discharge location subject to limitations and other applicable regulatory requirements for waste discharge, or as a delivery of recycled water.
- h. **Public Access Control.** If the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water determines that recycled water requirements or specific site use conditions are required to allow public access to the disposal ponds, this Order may be reopened to add or modify findings, specifications, limits, or other conditions as appropriate
- i. **Zinc.** This Order may be reopened and modified as necessary if monitoring results indicate that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard.

## 2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

- a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Requirements.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*" (Basin Plan at page III-8.00.) Based on whole effluent chronic toxicity testing performed by the Discharger from January 2010 through July 2015, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. In addition to WET monitoring, this provision requires the Discharger to submit to the Central Valley Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE Workplan for approval by the Executive Officer, to ensure the Discharger has a plan to immediately move forward with the initial tiers of a TRE, in the event effluent toxicity is encountered in the future. The provision also includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, requirements for accelerated monitoring, and requirements for TRE initiation if toxicity is demonstrated.

**Monitoring Trigger.** A numeric toxicity monitoring trigger of > 10 TUc (where TUc = 100/NOEC) is applied in the provision, because this Order does not allow any dilution for the chronic condition. Therefore, a TRE is triggered when the effluent exhibits toxicity at 100% effluent.

**Accelerated Monitoring.** The provision requires accelerated WET testing when a regular WET test result exceeds the monitoring trigger. The purpose of accelerated monitoring is to determine, in an expedient manner, whether there is toxicity before requiring the implementation of a TRE. Due to possible seasonality of the toxicity, the accelerated monitoring should be performed in a timely manner, preferably taking no more than 2 to 3 months to complete.

The provision requires accelerated monitoring consisting of four chronic toxicity tests in a six-week period (i.e., one test every two weeks) using the species that exhibited toxicity. Guidance regarding accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation is provided in the *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991 (TSD). The TSD at page 118 states, "EPA recommends if toxicity is repeatedly or periodically present at levels above effluent limits more than 20 percent of the time, a TRE should be required." Therefore, four accelerated monitoring tests are required in this provision. If no toxicity is demonstrated in the four accelerated tests, then it demonstrates that toxicity is not present at levels above the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time (only 1 of 5 tests are toxic, including the initial test). However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of effluent toxicity (i.e. toxicity present exceeding the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time), the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.

See the WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart (Figure F-1), below, for further clarification of the accelerated monitoring requirements and for the decision points for determining the need for TRE initiation.

**TRE Guidance.** The Discharger is required to prepare a TRE Workplan in accordance with USEPA guidance. Numerous guidance documents are available, as identified below:

*Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Guidance for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants*, EPA/833-B-99/002, August 1999.

*Generalized Methodology for Conducting Industrial Toxicity Reduction Evaluations (TREs)*, EPA/600/2-88/070, April 1989.

*Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase I Toxicity Characterization Procedures, Second Edition*, EPA 600/6-91/003, February 1991.

*Toxicity Identification Evaluation: Characterization of Chronically Toxic Effluents, Phase I*, EPA/600/6-91/005F, May 1992.

*Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase II Toxicity Identification Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and Chronic Toxicity, Second Edition*, EPA/600/R-92/080, September 1993.


*Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase III Toxicity Confirmation Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and Chronic Toxicity, Second Edition*, EPA 600/R-92/081, September 1993.

*Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms, Fifth Edition*, EPA-821-R-02-012, October 2002.

*Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition, EPA-821-R-02-013, October 2002.*

*Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991.*

**Figure F-2  
WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart**



- b. **Groundwater Monitoring Well Network Installation and Characterization.** In order to determine compliance with Groundwater Limitations V.B., and in accordance with requirements set forth in section VI.C.2.c, this provision requires the Discharger to develop a groundwater monitoring network, perform monitoring, and complete water quality analyses for characterization. The Discharger must ensure there are one or more background monitoring wells and a sufficient number of designated monitoring wells downgradient of every treatment, storage, and disposal unit that does or may release waste constituents to groundwater.

In accordance with California Business and Professions Code sections 6735, 7835, and 7835.1, engineering and geologic evaluations and judgments shall be performed by or under the direction of registered professionals competent and proficient in the fields pertinent to the required activities. The technical report shall be prepared by or under the direction of appropriately qualified professional(s) and shall bear the professional's signature and stamp.

- c. **Antidegradation Reevaluation.** The Discharger is required to submit an Antidegradation Reevaluation, as specified in section VI.C.2.c, to confirm that the land discharge continues to be consistent with the *State Anti-degradation Policy*.
- d. **Public Access Control.** The public has historically had access to areas within the Facility immediately surrounding the evaporation/percolation final disposal ponds to view waterfowl and other birds. If public access to these areas continues, **within 6 months following the effective date of this Order**, the Discharger shall submit documentation from the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (DDW) determining whether Title 22 recycled water requirements are necessary or if site use conditions are required. If so, this Order contains a Reopener provision to establish permit conditions as appropriate.

### 3. **Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention**

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan (SEMP) Annual Update.** The Discharger shall complete and submit annual update reports demonstrating on-going effort to control, limit, or reduce salinity in the discharge in accordance with the Discharger's SEMP. This report shall be submitted in accordance with annual reporting requirements specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E).

### 4. **Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications**

- a. The operation and maintenance specifications for the evaporation/percolation final disposal ponds and the emergency storage pond are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the groundwater. In addition, reporting requirements related to use of the ponds are required to monitor their use and the potential impact on groundwater.

### 5. **Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTW's Only)**

- a. **Pretreatment Requirements.**

The federal CWA section 307(b), and federal regulations, 40 C.F.R. part 403, require publicly owned treatment works to develop an acceptable industrial pretreatment program. A pretreatment program is required to prevent the introduction of pollutants, which will interfere with treatment plant operations or sludge disposal, and prevent pass through of pollutants that exceed water quality objectives, standards or permit limitations. Pretreatment requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 C.F.R. part 403.

The Discharger shall implement and enforce its approved pretreatment program and is an enforceable condition of this Order. If the Discharger fails to perform the pretreatment functions, the Central Valley Water Board, the State Water Board or USEPA may take enforcement actions against the Discharger as authorized by the CWA.

- b. The State Water Board issued General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, State Water Board Order 2006-0003-DWQ (General Order) on 2 May 2006. The Monitoring and Reporting Requirements for the General Order were amended by State Water Board Order WQ 2008-0002-EXEC on 20 February 2008. The General Order requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with greater than one mile of pipes or sewer lines to enroll for coverage under the General Order. The General Order also requires agencies to develop sanitary sewer management plans (SSMPs) and report all sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs), among other requirements and prohibitions.

Furthermore, the General Order contains requirements for operation and maintenance of collection systems and for reporting and mitigating sanitary sewer overflows. Inasmuch that the Discharger's collection system is part of the system that is subject to this Order, certain standard provisions are applicable as specified in Provisions, section VI.C.5. For instance, the 24-hour reporting requirements in this Order are not included in the General Order. The Discharger must comply with both the General Order and this Order. The Discharger and public agencies that are discharging wastewater into the facility were required to obtain enrollment for regulation under the General Order by 1 December 2006.

- c. **Anaerobically Digestible Material.** Managers of POTW's increasingly are considering the addition of organic material such as food waste, fats, oils and grease (FOG) into their anaerobic digesters for co-digestion. Benefits of accepting these materials include increasing the volume of methane and other biogases available for energy production and ensuring such materials are disposed of at the POTW instead of discharged into the collection system potentially causing sanitary sewer overflows. The State Water Board has been working with the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), and the California Association of Sanitation Agencies (CASA) to delineate jurisdictional authority for the receipt of hauled-in anaerobically digestible material (ADM<sup>1</sup>) at POTW's for co-digestion.

CalRecycle is proposing an exclusion from Process Facility/Transfer Station permits for direct injection of ADM to POTW anaerobic digesters for co-digestion that are regulated under waste discharge requirements or NPDES permits. The proposed CalRecycle exclusion is restricted to ADM that has been prescreened, slurried, and processed/conveyed in a closed system to be co-digested with regular POTW sludge. The CalRecycle exclusion assumes that a POTW has developed Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's) for the proper handling, processing, tracking, and management of the ADM received.

The Discharger currently does not accept hauled-in ADM for direct injection into its anaerobic digester for co-digestion. However, if the Discharger proposes to receive hauled-in ADM for injection into its anaerobic digester for co-digestion, this provision requires the Discharger to notify the Central Valley Water Board and develop and

---

<sup>1</sup> CalRecycle has proposed to define "anaerobically digestible material" to include inedible kitchen grease as defined in Food and Agricultural Code section 19216, food material as defined in California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 17852 and vegetative food material.

implement SOP's for this activity prior to initiation of the hauling. The requirements of the SOP's are discussed in Section VI.C.5.e.

**d. Other Special Provisions**

- i. Title 22, or Equivalent, Disinfection Requirements. Consistent with Order R5-2008-0185-01, this Order requires wastewater to be oxidized, coagulated, filtered, and adequately disinfected pursuant to DPH reclamation criteria, CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 3 (Title 22), or equivalent.

**6. Compliance Schedules**

- a. This Order includes new land discharge specifications for BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, total coliform organisms and percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS when discharging secondary treated and disinfected effluent to the evaporation/percolation final disposal ponds. The Discharger also utilizes these disposal ponds for emergency discharges whenever the discharge may not comply with regulatory requirements. The Discharger has demonstrated the need for additional time to implement actions, or construct necessary improvements, to comply with the new discharge specifications. Therefore, a compliance schedule for compliance with land discharge specifications for BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, total coliform organisms and percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS is established in this Order.

The compliance schedule for BOD<sub>5</sub>, TSS, total coliform organisms and percent removal of BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS are included in Special Provisions section VI.C.8.

**VII. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

CWA section 308 and 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(h), (j)-(l), 122.44(i), and 122.48 require that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Central Valley Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) in Attachment E of this Order establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements that implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the MRP for this facility.

**A. Influent Monitoring**

1. Influent monitoring is required to collect data on the characteristics of the wastewater and to assess compliance with standard provisions. The monitoring frequency for flow has been retained from Order No. R5-2010-0019.
2. Influent monitoring is required to collect data on the characteristics of the wastewater and to assess compliance with standard provisions. The monitoring frequency for temperature (daily) has been increased from Order No. R5-2010-0019.
3. Influent monitoring is required to collect data on the characteristics of the wastewater and to assess compliance with effluent limitations (e.g., BOD<sub>5</sub> and TSS reduction requirements). The monitoring frequency for biochemical oxygen demand (weekly), and total suspended solids (weekly), have been increased in this Order.
4. Influent monitoring is required to collect data on the characteristics of the wastewater and to assess compliance with standard provisions. Monitoring for influent pH (daily) has been included in this Order.

**B. Effluent Monitoring**

1. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(i)(2), effluent monitoring is required for all constituents with effluent limitations. Effluent monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with effluent limitations, assess the effectiveness of the treatment

process, and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream and groundwater.

2. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow (continuous), ammonia (monthly), biochemical oxygen demand (weekly), total suspended solids (weekly), total residual chlorine (continuous), total coliform organisms (weekly), chlorodibromomethane (monthly), total recoverable copper (monthly), dichlorobromomethane (monthly), temperature (weekly), electrical conductivity (monthly), total dissolved solids (quarterly), and acute toxicity (quarterly) have been retained from Order R5-2010-0019 to determine compliance with effluent limitations for these parameters.
3. Effluent monitoring frequency and sample type for pH (continuous) has been increased in this Order to determine compliance with effluent limitations for this parameter.
4. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types for Priority Pollutants have been reduced to four quarterly sampling events in one year only in this Order. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to characterize the effluent.
5. Water Code section 13176, subdivision (a), states: "*The analysis of any material required by [Water Code sections 13000-16104] shall be performed by a laboratory that has accreditation or certification pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 100825) of Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 101 of the Health and Safety Code.*" The State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water certifies laboratories through its Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP).

Section 13176 cannot be interpreted in a manner that would violate federal holding time requirements that apply to NPDES permits pursuant to the CWA. (Wat. Code §§ 13370, subd. (c), 13372, 13377.) Section 13176 is inapplicable to NPDES permits to the extent it is inconsistent with CWA requirements. (Wat. Code § 13372, subd. (a).) The holding time requirements are 15 minutes for chlorine residual, dissolved oxygen, and pH, and immediate analysis is required for temperature. (40 C.F.R. § 136.3(e), Table II).

### **C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements**

1. **Acute Toxicity.** Quarterly 96-hour bioassay testing is required to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitation for acute toxicity.
2. **Chronic Toxicity.** Annual chronic whole effluent toxicity testing is required in order to demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

### **D. Receiving Water Monitoring**

#### **1. Surface Water**

- a. Receiving water monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with receiving water limitations and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream.
- b. Receiving water monitoring requirements have been retained for dissolved oxygen (monthly), pH (monthly), temperature (monthly), turbidity (monthly), and total recoverable copper (quarterly).
- c. This Order reduces the monitoring frequencies established in Order R5-2010-0019 for Priority Pollutants to one year of quarterly sampling and to quarterly sampling for chlorodibromomethane and dichlorobromomethane. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to characterize the receiving water.
- d. This Order increases the monitoring frequencies established in Order R5-2010-0019 for hardness (quarterly), electrical conductivity (monthly), and total dissolved solids (monthly), The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to characterize the receiving water.

- e. This Order includes receiving water monitoring requirements for ammonia (quarterly), cyanide (for 8 quarters only), and nitrate plus nitrite (quarterly). The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is sufficient to characterize the receiving water.

## **2. Groundwater**

- a. Water Code section 13267 states, in part, “(a) A Regional Water Board, in establishing...waste discharge requirements... may investigate the quality of any waters of the state within its region” and “(b) (1) In conducting an investigation..., the Regional Water Board may require that any person who... discharges... waste...that could affect the quality of waters within its region shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the Regional Water Board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports.” In requiring those reports, a Regional Water Board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program is authorized by? Water Code section 13267. The groundwater monitoring and reporting program required by this Order and the Monitoring and Reporting Program are necessary to assure compliance with these waste discharge requirements. The Discharger is responsible for the discharges of waste at the facility subject to this Order.
- b. Monitoring of the groundwater must be conducted to confirm that any groundwater degradation resulting from the discharge is in compliance with the groundwater limitations contained in this Order, and ensure protection of beneficial uses and compliance with Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board plans and policies, including the State Anti-Degradation Policy. This Order requires a regular schedule of groundwater monitoring in the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- c. This Order requires the Discharger to begin groundwater monitoring and includes a regular schedule of groundwater monitoring in the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program. The groundwater monitoring reports are necessary to evaluate impacts to waters of the State to assure protection of beneficial uses and compliance with Central Valley Water Board plans and policies, including State Board Resolution No. 68-16. Evidence in the record includes effluent monitoring data that indicates the presence of constituents that may degrade groundwater and surface water.

## **E. Other Monitoring Requirements**

### **1. Biosolids Monitoring**

Biosolids monitoring is required to ensure compliance with the biosolids disposal requirements contained in the Special Provision contained in section VI.C.5.b. of this Order. Biosolids disposal requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 C.F.R. part 503 to protect public health and prevent groundwater degradation.

### **2. Water Supply Monitoring**

Water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the source of constituents in the wastewater.

### **3. Pond Monitoring**

Disposal pond monitoring is required to ensure proper operation of the evaporation/percolation final disposal ponds. Weekly monitoring for freeboard, odors, and other field parameters have been included in this Order.

**4. Land Discharge Monitoring**

Land discharge monitoring is required to ensure that the discharge to the evaporation/percolation final disposal ponds complies with Land Discharge Specifications section IV.B, Receiving Water Limitations section V.B, and Provisions section VI.C.4 of this Order. Monitoring frequencies and sample types for flow (continuous), biochemical oxygen demand (weekly), total suspended solids (weekly), pH (daily), and total coliform organisms (weekly) have been included in this from Order.

**5. Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study Program**

Under the authority of section 308 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. § 1318), U.S. EPA requires major permittees under the NPDES Program to participate in the annual DMR-QA Study Program. The DMR-QA Study evaluates the analytical ability of laboratories that routinely perform or support self-monitoring analyses required by NPDES permits. There are two options to satisfy the requirements of the DMR-QA Study Program: (1) The Discharger can obtain and analyze a DMR-QA sample as part of the DMR-QA Study; or (2) Per the waiver issued by U.S.EPA to the State Water Board, the Discharger can submit the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study from their own laboratories or their contract laboratories. A Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study is similar to the DMR-QA Study. Thus, it also evaluates a laboratory's ability to analyze wastewater samples to produce quality data that ensure the integrity of the NPDES Program. The Discharger shall submit annually the results of the DMR-QA Study or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to the State Water Board. The State Water Board's Quality Assurance Program Officer will send the DMR-QA Study results or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to U.S. EPA's DMR-QA Coordinator and Quality Assurance Manager.

**VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Central Valley Water Board has considered the issuance of WDR's that will serve as an NPDES permit for the Chico Water Pollution Control Plant. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the Central Valley Water Board staff has developed tentative WDR's and has encouraged public participation in the WDR adoption process.

**A. Notification of Interested Parties**

The Central Valley Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDR's for the discharge and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through the local newspaper, posting of the NOPH at various local public buildings, and posting on the City of Chico website.

The public had access to the agenda and any changes in dates and locations through the Central Valley Water Board's website at:

[http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board\\_info/meetings/](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_info/meetings/)

**B. Written Comments**

Interested persons were invited to submit written comments concerning tentative WDR's as provided through the notification process. Comments were due either in person or by mail to the Executive Office at the Central Valley Water Board at the address on the cover page of this Order.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Central Valley Water Board, the written comments were due at the Central Valley Water Board office by 5:00 p.m. on **<Date>**.

**C. Public Hearing**

The Central Valley Water Board held a public hearing on the tentative WDR's during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location:

Date: **22 April 2016**  
Time: 8:30 a.m.  
Location: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region  
1685 "E" Street  
Fresno, CA 93706-2007

Interested persons were invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Central Valley Water Board heard testimony pertinent to the discharge, WDR's, and permit. For accuracy of the record, important testimony was requested in writing.

**D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements**

Any aggrieved person may petition the State Water Board to review the decision of the Central Valley Water Board regarding the final WDR's. The petition must be received by the State Water Board at the following address within 30 calendar days of the Central Valley Water Board's action:

State Water Resources Control Board  
Office of Chief Counsel  
P.O. Box 100, 1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

For instructions on how to file a petition for review, see [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public\\_notices/petitions/water\\_quality/wqpetition\\_instr.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml)

**E. Information and Copying**

The Report of Waste Discharge, other supporting documents, and comments received are on file and may be inspected at the Regional Water Quality Control Board address above at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Central Valley Water Board by calling (916) 464-3291.

**F. Register of Interested Persons**

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDR's and NPDES permit should contact the Central Valley Water Board, reference this facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

**G. Additional Information**

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this order should be directed to Scott Gilbreath at (530) 224-4851.



**ATTACHMENT G – SUMMARY OF REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS**

Constituent	Units	MEC	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	Basin Plan	MCL	Reasonable Potential
2,3,7,8-TCDD	pg/L	ND	ND	.013	--	--	0.013	0.014	--	30	NO
Aluminum	µg/L	100/ 41 <sup>1</sup>	650/ 135 <sup>1</sup>	750/ 200 <sup>1</sup>	750	--	--	--	--	200 <sup>2</sup>	NO
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	1.96	0.1		2.14	1.4	--	--	--	--	YES
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	3.0	0.049	0.41	--	--	0.41	34	--	80	YES
Copper	µg/L	8.9	4.7	8.9	8.9	6.2	1300	--	--	1000	YES
Cyanide	µg/L	27	32	5.2	22	5.2	700	220000	--	150	NO
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	20	0.031	0.56	--	--	0.56	46	--	80	YES
Nitrate plus nitrite (as N)	mg/L	30	0.09	10	--	--	10	--	--	10	YES
Zinc	µg/L	44	DNQ	80	80	80	7400	26000	102	5000 <sup>3</sup>	NO

General Note: All inorganic concentrations are given as a total recoverable.

MEC = Maximum Effluent Concentration

B = Maximum Receiving Water Concentration or lowest detection level, if non-detect

C = Criterion used for Reasonable Potential Analysis

CMC = Criterion Maximum Concentration (CTR or NTR)

CCC = Criterion Continuous Concentration (CTR or NTR)

Water & Org = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Water & Organisms (CTR or NTR)

Org. Only = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Organisms Only (CTR or NTR)

Basin Plan = Numeric Site-specific Basin Plan Water Quality Objective

MCL = Drinking Water Standards Maximum Contaminant Level

NA = Not Available

ND = Non-detect

DNQ = Detected but not quantified below reportable level

Footnotes:

(1) Annual average

(2) Secondary MCL

## ATTACHMENT H – CALCULATION OF WQBEL'S

Human Health WQBEL's Calculations									
Parameter	Units	Criteria	Mean Background Concentration	Dilution Factor	MDEL/AMEL Multiplier	AMEL Multiplier	AMEL	MDEL	AWEL
Chlorodibromomethane	µg/L	0.41	0.04	46.5	1.98	1.53	17.2	34	--
Dichlorobromomethane	µg/L	0.56	0.031	46.5	1.71	1.38	25.2	43	--
Nitrate plus Nitrite, Total (as N)	mg/L	10	0.09	5	1.73 <sup>2</sup>	1.55	60	--	104 <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The AWEL was calculated from the AMEL using an AWEL/AMEL multiplier following procedures outlined in SIP for a z value of 2.054 for 98<sup>th</sup> percentile probability basis.

<sup>2</sup> AWEL/AMEL multiplier.

Aquatic Life WQBEL's Calculations															
Parameter	Units	Criteria		Dilution Factors		Aquatic Life Calculations							Final Effluent Limitations		
		CMC	CCC	CMC	CCC	ECA Multiplier <sub>acute</sub>	LTA <sub>acute</sub>	ECA Multiplier <sub>chronic</sub>	LTA <sub>chronic</sub>	AMEL Multiplier <sub>95</sub>	AWEL Multiplier <sub>98</sub>	MDEL Multiplier <sub>99</sub>	AMEL <sup>1</sup>	AWEL <sup>2</sup>	MDEL <sup>3</sup>
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	2.14	1.4	12.2	4.7	0.09	2.38	0.32	2.38	3.44	7.38	--	8.2	17.6	--
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	8.9	6.2	2.7	6.6	0.63	12.73	0.79	12.73	1.18	--	1.58	15	--	20

<sup>1</sup> Average Monthly Effluent Limitations are calculated according to Section 1.4 of the SIP using a 95<sup>th</sup> percentile occurrence probability.

<sup>2</sup> Average Weekly Effluent Limitations are calculated according to Section 1.4 of the SIP using a 98<sup>th</sup> percentile occurrence probability.

<sup>3</sup> Maximum Daily Effluent Limitations are calculated according to Section 1.4 of the SIP using a 99<sup>th</sup> percentile occurrence probability.

**ATTACHMENT I – REQUIREMENTS FOR MONITORING WELL INSTALLATION WORK PLANS  
AND MONITORING WELL INSTALLATION REPORTS**

Prior to installation of groundwater monitoring wells, the Discharger shall submit a work plan containing, at a minimum, the information listed in Section 1, below. Wells may be installed after staff approve the work plan. Upon installation of the monitoring wells, the Discharger shall submit a well installation report which includes the information contained in Section 2, below. All work plans and reports must be prepared under the direction of, and signed by, a registered geologist or civil engineer licensed by the State of California.

**SECTION 1 - Monitoring Well Installation Work Plan and  
Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Plan**

The monitoring well installation work plan shall contain, at a minimum, the following information:

A. General Information:

- Purpose of the well installation project
- Brief description of local geologic and hydrogeologic conditions
- Proposed monitoring well locations and rationale for well locations
- Topographic map showing facility location, roads, and surface water bodies
- Large-scaled site map showing all existing on-site wells, proposed wells, surface water bodies and drainage courses, surface water bodies, buildings, waste handling facilities, utilities, and major physical and man-made features

B. Drilling Details:

- On-site supervision of drilling and well installation activities
- Description of drilling equipment and techniques
- Equipment decontamination procedures
- Cuttings disposal methods
- Soil sampling intervals (if appropriate); logging methods; number and location of soil samples and rationale; and sample collection, preservations, and analytical methods

C. Monitoring Well Design (in graphic form with rationale provided in narrative form):

- Diagram of proposed well construction details
  - Borehole diameter
  - Casing and screen material, diameter, and centralizer spacing (if needed)
  - Type of well caps (bottom cap either screw on or secured with stainless steel screws)
  - Anticipated depth of well, length of well casing, and length and position of perforated interval
  - Thickness, position and composition of surface seal, sanitary seal, and sand pack pack
  - Anticipated screen slot size and filter pack

D. Well Development (not to be performed until at least 48 hours after sanitary seal placement):

- Method of development to be used (i.e., surge, bail, pump, etc.)
- Parameters to be monitored during development and record keeping technique
- Method of determining when development is complete
- Disposal of development water

E. Well Survey (precision of vertical survey data shall be at least 0.01 foot):

Identify the Licensed Land Surveyor or Civil Engineer that will perform the survey  
Datum for survey measurements  
List well features to be surveyed (i.e. top of casing, horizontal and vertical coordinates, etc.)

F. Schedule for Completion of Work

G. Appendix: Groundwater Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP)

The Groundwater SAP, a guidance document that is referred to by individuals responsible for conducting groundwater monitoring and sampling activities, shall contain, at a minimum, a detailed written description of standard operating procedures for:

- Equipment to be used during sampling
- Equipment decontamination procedures
- Water level measurement procedures
- Well purging (include a discussion of procedures to follow if three casing volumes cannot be purged)
- Monitoring and record keeping during water level measurement and well purging (include copies of record keeping logs to be used)
- Purge water disposal
- Analytical methods and required reporting limits
- Sample containers and preservatives
- Sampling
  - o General sampling techniques
  - o Record keeping during sampling (include copies of record keeping logs to be used)
  - o QA/QC samples
- Chain of Custody
- Sample handling and transport

**SECTION 2 - Monitoring Well Installation Report**

The monitoring well installation report must provide the information listed below. In addition, the report must also clearly identify, describe, and justify any deviations from the approved work plan.

A. General Information:

Purpose of the well installation project  
Number of monitoring wells installed and identifying label(s) for each  
Brief description of geologic and hydrogeologic conditions encountered during well installation  
Topographic map showing facility location, roads, surface water bodies  
Large-scaled site map showing all previously existing wells, newly installed wells, surface water bodies and drainage courses, buildings, waste handling facilities, utilities, and other major physical and man-made features.

B. Drilling Details (in narrative and/or graphic form):

On-site supervision of drilling and well installation activities  
Drilling contractor and driller's name  
Description of drilling equipment and techniques  
Equipment decontamination procedures

- Well boring log (provide for each well)
  - Well boring number and date drilled
  - Borehole diameter and total depth
  - Total depth of open hole (i.e., total depth drilled if no caving or back-grouting occurs)
  - Depth to first encountered groundwater and stabilized groundwater depth
  - Detailed description of soils encountered, using the Unified Soil Classification System

C. Well Construction Details (in graphic and narrative form for each well):

Well construction diagram, including:

- Monitoring well number and date constructed
- Casing and screen material, diameter, and centralizer spacing (if needed)
- Length of well casing
- Length and position of slotted casing and size of perforations
- Thickness, position and composition of surface seal, sanitary seal, and sand pack
- Type of well caps (bottom cap either screw on or secured with stainless steel screws)

D. Well Development (provide for each well):

Date(s) and method of development  
How well development completion was determined  
Volume of water purged from well and method of development water disposal  
Field notes from well development should be included in report

E. Well Survey (provide for each well):

Reference elevation at the top rim of the well casing with the cap removed (feet above mean sea level to within 0.01 foot)  
Ground surface elevation (feet above mean sea level to within 0.01 foot)  
Horizontal geodetic location, where the point of beginning shall be described by the California State Plane Coordination System, 1983 datum, or acceptable alternative (provide rationale)  
Present the well survey report data in a table

G. Water Sampling:

Date (s) of sampling	Sample identification
How well was purged	Analytical methods used
How many well volumes purged	Laboratory analytical data sheets
Levels of temperature, EC, and pH at stabilization	Water level elevation(s)
Sample collection, handling, and preservation methods	Groundwater contour map

H. Soil Sampling (if applicable)

Date(s) of sampling  
Sample collection, handling, and preservation models  
Sample identification  
Analytical methods used

Laboratory analytical data sheets  
Present soil sampling data in a table

- I. Well Completion Report(s) (as defined in California Water Code §13751). Blank forms are available from California Department of Water Resources' website **www.water.ca.gov**. Submit this section under separate cover.
- J. Appendix - include, at a minimum, copies of the following:
  - County-issued well construction permits
  - Registered engineer or licensed surveyor's report and field notes
  - Field notes from well development